arXiv:1704.00984v1 [math.PR] 4 Apr 2017

PROBABILISTIC APPROACH TO FINITE STATE MEAN FIELD GAMES

ALEKOS CECCHIN AND MARKUS FISCHER

Abstract. We study mean field games and corresponding N-player games in continuous time over a finite time horizon where the position of each agent belongs to a finite state space. As opposed to previous works on finite state mean field games, we use a probabilistic representation of the system dynamics in terms of stochastic differential equations driven by Poisson random measures. Under mild assumptions, we prove existence of solutions to the mean field game in relaxed open-loop as well as relaxed feedback controls. Relying on the probabilistic representation and a coupling argument, we show that mean field game solutions provide symmetric ε_N-Nash equilibria for the N-player game, both in open-loop and in feedback strategies (not relaxed), with $\varepsilon_N \leq \frac{\text{constant}}{\sqrt{N}}$. Under stronger assumptions, we also find solutions of the mean field game in ordinary feedback controls and prove uniqueness in case of a small time horizon.

1. Introduction

Mean field games, as independently introduced by Lasry and Lions (2007) and by Huang et al. (2006), represent limit models for symmetric non-zero-sum non-cooperative N-player dynamic games with mean field interactions when the number N of players tends to infinity. For an introduction to mean field games see Cardaliaguet (2013), Carmona et al. (2013) and Bensoussan et al. (2013); the latter two works also deal with optimal control problems of McKean-Vlasov type. There is by now a wealth of works dealing with different classes of mean field games; for a partial overview see Gomes et al. (2015) and the references therein. Here, we restrict attention to a class of finite time horizon problems with continuous time dynamics and fully symmetric cost structure, where the position of each agent belongs to a finite state space.

The relation between the limit model (the mean field game) and the corresponding prelimit models (the N-player games) can be understood in two different directions: approximation and convergence. By approximation we mean that a solution of the mean field game allows to construct approximate Nash equilibria for the N-player games, where the approximation error is arbitrarily small for N big enough. By convergence we mean that Nash equilibria for the N-player games may be expected to converge to a solution of the mean field game as N tends to infinity.

Results in the approximation direction are more common and usually provide the justification for the definition of the mean field game. When the underlying dynamics is of Itô type without jumps, such results were established by Huang et al. (2006) and, more recently, by for instance Carmona and Delarue (2013), Carmona and Lacker

Date: April 5, 2017.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60J27, 60K35, 91A10, 93E20.

Key words and phrases. Mean field games, finite state space, relaxed controls, relaxed Poisson measures, N-person games, approximate Nash equilibria, chattering lemma.

This work is (partially) supported by the PhD programme in Mathematical Sciences, Department of mathematics, University of Padua (Italy) and Progetto Dottorati - Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Padova e Rovigo.

(2015) and Bensoussan et al. (2016). When the dynamics is driven by generators of Lévy type, but with the control appearing only in the drift, an approximation result is found in Kolokoltsov et al. (2011).

Rigorous results on convergence to the mean field game limit in the non-stationary case (finite time horizon) are even more recent. While the limits of N-player Nash equilibria in stochastic open-loop strategies can be completely characterized (see Lacker (2016) and Fischer (2017) for general systems of Itô type), the convergence problem is more difficult for Nash equilibria in Markov feedback strategies with global state information. A breakthrough was achieved by Cardaliaguet et al. (2015). Their proof of convergence relies on having a regular solution to the so-called master equation. This is a kind of transport equation on the space of probability measures associated with the mean field game; its solution yields a solution to the mean field game for any initial time and initial distribution. If the mean field game is such that its master equation possesses a unique regular solution, then that solution can be used to prove convergence of the costs associated with the N-player Nash equilibria, as well as a weak form of convergence of the corresponding feedback strategies. An important ingredient in the proof is a coupling argument similar to the one employed in deriving the propagation of chaos property for uncontrolled mean field systems (cf. Sznitman, 1991). This kind of coupling argument, in which independent copies of the limit process are compared to their prelimit counterparts, is useful also for obtaining approximation results; cf. for instance the above cited works by Huang et al. (2006) and Carmona and Delarue (2013).

In this paper, we focus on games where the position of each agent belongs to a given finite state space $\Sigma := \{1, \dots, d\}$. Such games have been studied by Gomes et al. (2013), and also by Basna et al. (2014). Their approach to the problem is based on PDE / ODE methods and the infinitesimal generator (Q matrix) of the system dynamics; we will return to this shortly.

Here, we adopt a different approach based on a probabilistic representation. We write the dynamics of the N-player game as a system of stochastic differential equations driven by independent stationary Poisson random measures with the same intensity measure ν, weakly coupled through the empirical measure of the system states:

(1.1)
$$X_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, X_i^N(s^-), u, \alpha_i^N(s), \mu^N(s^-)) \mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du), \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where α_i^N is the control of player i (here in open loop form) with values in a compact set A and $\mu^N(s^-)$ is the empirical measure of the system immediately before time s. The dynamics for the one representative player of the mean field limit is analogously written as

$$X(t) = \xi + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, X(s^-), u, \alpha(s), m(s)) \mathcal{N}(ds, du), \tag{1.2}$$

where α is the control and $m : [0, T] \to \mathcal{P}(\Sigma)$ a deterministic flow of probability measures, which takes the place of μ^N.

Representations (1.1) and (1.2) of the system dynamics allow to obtain approximation results with error bounds of the form $\frac{\text{constant}}{\sqrt{N}}$ for the approximate N-player Nash equilibria via the aforementioned coupling argument. This is what we will do here. The probabilistic representation should be useful also for the problem of convergence to the mean field limit; this is left to future work.

The function f appearing in (1.1) and (1.2) can be chosen so that the corresponding state processes X_i^N, X have prescribed transition rates when the control and measure variable are held constant. Following an idea of Graham (1992), we choose

$U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let the intensity measure ν be given by d copies of Lebesgue measure on the line (cf. (2.34) below), and set

$$f(t,x,u,a,p) := \sum_{y \in \Sigma} (y-x) \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y). \tag{1.3}$$

With this f we have, as $h \to 0$,

$$P\left[X(t+h) = y | X(t) = x\right] = \lambda(t,x,y,\alpha,m) \cdot h + o(h)$$

if $y \neq x$, for any constant control α and probability measure m. Thus, $\lambda(t,x,y,\alpha,m)$ is the transition rate from state x to state y.

We will consider several types of controls: open-loop, feedback, relaxed open-loop and relaxed feedback. Each player wants to optimize his cost functional over a finite time horizon T. The coefficients representing running and terminal costs may depend on the measure variable and are the same for all players.

We first study the mean field game and show that it admits a solution in relaxed controls. The solution of the mean field game can be seen as a fixed point. For a given flow of measures $m(\cdot)$, find a strategy α_m that is optimal and let $X^{\alpha_m,m}$ be the corresponding solution of Eq. (1.2). Now find m such that $Law(X(t)) = m(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. Under mild hypotheses, we prove existence of solutions in relaxed open-loop controls using the Ky Fan fixed point theorem for point-to-set maps. This is analogous to the existence result obtained by Lacker (2015) for general dynamics driven by Wiener processes. As there, we will characterize solutions to Eq. (1.2) through the associated controlled martingale problem. In order to write the dynamics when using a relaxed control, we need to work with relaxed Poisson measures in the sense of Kushner and Dupuis (2001); also see Appendix A below. The same assumptions that give existence in relaxed open-loop controls also yield existence of solutions in relaxed feedback controls. Relaxed controls are used only for the limit model.

Then we show that those relaxed mean field game solutions provide ε_N-Nash equilibria for the N-player game both in ordinary open-loop and ordinary feedback strategies. To this end, we approximate a limiting optimal relaxed control by an ordinary one, using a version of the chattering lemma that also works for feedback controls, at least in our finite setting. The approximating control is then shown to provide a symmetric ε_N-Nash equilibrium, with $\varepsilon_N \leq \frac{\text{constant}}{\sqrt{N}}$, decentralized when considering feedback strategies. As explained above, our proof relies on the probabilistic representation of the system and a coupling argument.

We also study the problem of finding solutions of the mean field game in ordinary feedback controls. There, we need stronger assumptions in order to guarantee the uniqueness of an optimal feedback control for any fixed m (existence always holds). Moreover we prove, under additional assumptions, that the feedback mean field game solution is unique provided the time horizon T is small enough.

Roughly speaking, we need to assume only the continuity of the rates λ in order to have relaxed or relaxed feedback mean field game solutions and to obtain ε_N-Nash equilibria for the N-player game, both open-loop and feedback. Under stronger assumptions, namely linearity of λ in the control and strict convexity of the cost, we get the uniqueness of the optimal feedback control for any m through the uniqueness of the minimizer of the associated Hamiltonian. Under assumptions similar to these latter, Basna et al. (2014) study the problem in the framework of non-linear Markov processes and find $\frac{1}{N}$-Nash equilibria for the N-player game. In Gomes et al. (2013), the transition rates coincide with the control, in analogy with the original works of Lasry and Lions, and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$-Nash equilibria are obtained. Both these works consider ordinary feedback controls only, hence feedback solutions of the mean field game.

The work by Gomes et al. (2013) also contains a result in the convergence direction. More precisely, convergence of N-player Nash equilibria in feedback controls to the mean field limit is established, but only if the time horizon T is sufficiently small. Moreover, the authors prove a result about the uniqueness of feedback mean field game solutions for arbitrary time horizon. The assumptions needed in this case are the monotonicity conditions on the cost coefficients as introduced by Lasry and Lions.

Lastly, let us mention two recent preprints. In Doncel et al. (2016), continuous time mean field games with finite state space and finite action space are studied. The authors prove existence of solutions to the mean field game, corresponding to what we call solutions in relaxed feedback controls. Their prelimit models (the N-player games) are different and difficult to compare to ours since they are set in discrete time. The second work we mention is Benazzoli et al. (2017). There, the authors study a class of mean field games with jump diffusion dynamics. An existence result for the mean field game in the spirit of Lacker (2015) is given. The authors also obtain a convergence result in a special situation where Nash equilibria for the N-player games can be found explicitly. In their model, the jump heights are directly (and linearly) controlled, not the jump intensities.

Structure of the paper. In Section 2, we introduce the notation and various assumptions to be used in the sequel. Then we describe the N-player games as well as the corresponding mean field game, giving the relevant definitions of Nash equilibrium and solution of the mean field game. Relaxed controls (open-loop and feedback) are introduced there as well, while a proper definition of relaxed Poisson measures is given in Appendix A. All main assumptions are verified to hold for the natural shape of f in (1.3).

In Section 3, we establish existence of solutions to the mean field game in relaxed open-loop as well as relaxed feedback controls.

In Section 4, we find, under additional assumptions, mean field game solutions in non-relaxed feedback controls by proving the uniqueness of the optimal control for any flow of measures. Moreover, uniqueness of solutions is proved for small T.

In Section 5, we first establish a version of the chattering lemma that works also for feedback controls. Then we turn to the construction of approximate Nash equilibria coming from a solution of the mean field game, and derive the error bound mentioned above for feedback as well as open-loop strategies.

Section 6 contains a summary of the main results.

2. Description of the model

2.1. **Notations and assumptions.** Throughout the paper, we fix $\Sigma = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ to be the finite state space of any player. Let T be the finite time horizon and $(A, dist)$ be a compact metric space, the space of control values. Let U be a compact set in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let ν be a Radon measure on U. Let

$$S := \mathcal{P}(\Sigma) = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^d : p_j \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, d; \quad p_1 + \dots + p_d = 1\}$$

be the space of probability measures on Σ, which is the probability simplex in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $f : [0,T] \times \Sigma \times U \times A \times S \longrightarrow \{-d, \dots, d\}$ be a measurable function (appearing in the dynamics (1.2) and (1.1)) such that $f(t, x, u, a, p) \in \{1 - x, \dots, d - x\}$. Let $c : [0,T] \times \Sigma \times A \times S \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the running cost and $\psi : \Sigma \times S$ be the terminal cost, which will be the same for any player and so also for the mean field game.

We will denote by $\mathcal{N}$ any stationary Poisson random measure on $[0,T] \times U$ with intensity measure ν on U and by $\mathcal{N}^N = (\mathcal{N}_1^N, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N^N)$ a vector of N i.i.d. stationary Poisson random measures, each with the same law as $\mathcal{N}$. The initial point of the N-player game will be represented by N i.i.d. random variables $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N$

with values in Σ and common distribution $m_0 \in S$, which will be fixed throughout. Similarly, the initial point of the limiting system will be represented by a random variable ξ with law m_0.

The state of player i at time t is denoted by $X_i^N(t)$. The trajectories of any process X_i^N are assumed to be in $D([0,T],\Sigma)$, which denotes the space of càdlàg functions from $[0,T]$ to Σ, endowed with the Skorokhod metric. Let $\mu^N(t) := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_i^N(t)}$ be the empirical measure of the system of N players. In the limiting dynamics, the empirical measure is replaced by a deterministic *flow* of probability measures $m : [0,T] \longrightarrow S$.

The space of measures S can be equipped with any norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$, as they are all equivalent, so we choose the Euclidean norm $|p|$. We observe that S is a compact and convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}([0,T],S)$ the space of continuous functions from $[0,T]$ to S, endowed with the uniform norm. The space of flows of probability measures on S will be denoted by $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{C}([0,T],S)$, which will be shown in Subsection 3.1 to be

$$\mathcal{L} := \{m : [0,T] \longrightarrow S : |m(t) - m(s)| \le K|t-s|, \quad m(0) = m_0\}$$

where the constant is $K := 2\nu(U)\sqrt{d}$.

We will study several types of controls. Pathwise existence and uniqueness of solutions to the controlled dynamics (1.2), with trajectories that remain in Σ, is guaranteed by the following Lipschitz condition:

$$\int_U |f(s,x,u,a,p) - f(s,x,u,a,p)|\nu(du) \le K_1|x-y| \tag{2.1}$$

for every $x, y \in \Sigma, s \in [0,T], a \in A$ and $p \in S$, where K_1 is a constant. The above condition is always satisfied in our model since $|x-y| \ge 1$ for each $x \ne y \in \Sigma$ and $\int_U |f(s,x,u,a,p)| \le \nu(U)d$; thus we may take $K_1 = 2\nu(U)d$.

2.1.1. *Assumptions.* Let us summarize here the assumptions we will make on our model:

(A) The function $\tilde{f} : [0,T] \times \Sigma \times A \times S \longrightarrow L^1(\nu)$ defined by $\tilde{f}(t,x,a,p) := f(t,x,\cdot,a,p) \in L^1(\nu)$ is continuous in t,a,p (uniformly, and is bounded), i.e. there exists a modulus of continuity w_f such that $\lim_{h\to 0} w_f(h) = 0$ and

$$\int_U |f(t,x,u,a,p) - f(s,x,u,b,q)|\nu(du) \le w_f(|t-s| + dist(a,b) + |p-q|) \tag{2.2}$$

for every $t, s \in [0,T]$, $x \in \Sigma$, $a, b \in A$, $p, q \in S$;

(A') Assumption (A) holds and $\tilde{f}$ is Lipschitz in $p \in S$:

$$\int_U |f(t,x,u,a,p) - f(t,y,u,a,q)|\nu(du) \le K_1(|x-y| + |p-q|); \tag{2.3}$$

(A") Assumption (A') holds and$\tilde{f}$ is Lipschitz also in $a \in A$:

$$\int_U |f(t,x,u,a,p) - f(t,y,u,b,q)|\nu(du) \le K_1(|x-y| + |p-q| + dist(a,b)); \tag{2.4}$$

(B) The running cost c is continuous (and bounded) in t,x,a,p and the terminal cost is continuous (and bounded) in x,p;

(B') Assumption (B) holds and the costs c and ψ are Lipschitz in p:

$$|c(t,x,a,p) - c(t,y,a,q)| + |\psi(x,p) - \psi(y,q)| \le K_2(|x-y| + |p-q|); \tag{2.5}$$

(B") Assumption (B') holds and the running cost c is Lipschitz also in a:

$$|c(t,x,a,p) - c(t,y,b,q)| + |\psi(x,p) - \psi(y,q)| \le K_2[|x-y| + dist(a,b) + |p-q|]. \tag{2.6}$$

The above assumptions will be used in Sections 3 and 5 to find solutions of the mean field game and then approximate Nash equilibria for the N-player game, both in open-loop and in feedback form.

The following two assumptions are more implicit. We identify the set of functions $g : \Sigma \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbb{R}^d$ and observe that any g is bounded and Lipschitz. For any $x \in \Sigma$, $0 \le t \le T$, $a \in A$, $p \in S$ and $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ define the *generator*

$$\Lambda_t^{a,p} g(x) := \int_U [g(x + f(t, x, u, a, p)) - g(x)]\nu(du) \tag{2.7}$$

and the *pre-Hamiltonian*

$$H(t, x, a, p, g) := \Lambda_t^{a,p} g(x) + c(t, x, a, p). \tag{2.8}$$

In order to obtain existence and uniqueness of feedback mean field game solutions, in Section 4, we will make the additional hypothesis:

- **(C)** For any t, x, p and g there exists a unique $a^* = a^*(t, x, p, g)$ minimizer of $H(t, x, a, p, g)$ in A;
- **(D)** Any solution X of (1.2) has the property that $P(X(t) = x) > 0$ for any $x \in \Sigma$ and $0 < t \le T$.

We observe that for any fixed p and g the function $a^*(t, x)$ is measurable, thanks to Theorem D.5 in Hernández-Lerma and Lasserre (1996). We remark also that the limiting dynamics (1.2) always admits a pathwise unique solution thanks to (2.1).

2.2. **N-player game.** In the prelimit, we consider a system of N symmetric players governed by the dynamics

$$X_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, X_i^N(s^-), u, \alpha_i^N(s), \mu^N(s^-))\mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du) \qquad i = 1, \dots, N, \tag{2.9}$$

where $X^N = (X_1^N, \dots, X_N^N)$ and $\mu^N(t) := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_i^N(t)}$. Here the controls α_i^N are in open-loop form. Let us specify the controls to be used in the N-player game.

Definition 1. *Define the set of* strategy vectors *as*

$$\mathcal{A}^N := \big\{((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \alpha^N, \xi^N, \mathcal{N}^N)\big\}$$

where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F})$ is a filtered probability space, $\xi^N := (\xi_1^N, \dots, \xi_N^N)$ is a vector of N i.i.d random variables with law m_0, the initial points, $\mathcal{N}^N = (\mathcal{N}_1^N, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N^N)$ is a vector of N i.i.d. Poisson random measure with intensity ν on U, whose filtration is in $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$, $\mathcal{F}_T = \mathcal{F}$, and $\alpha^N = (\alpha_1^N, \dots, \alpha_N^N)$, α_i^N is an A-valued $\mathbb{F}$-predictable process for each i. We will often write $\alpha^N \in \mathcal{A}^N$ to indicate the process α^N.

Define also the set of feedback strategy vectors *as*

$$\mathbb{A}^N := \big\{((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \gamma^N, \xi^N, \mathcal{N}^N)\big\}$$

where $\gamma^N = (\gamma_1^N, \dots, \gamma_N^N) : [0, T] \times \Sigma^N \to A^N$ is measurable and the filtered probability space and the ξ^N and $\mathcal{N}^N$ are as above. We will often write $\gamma^N \in \mathbb{A}^N$ to indicate the function γ^N.

We observe that the above definition of feedback strategy vector is not standard, as it is given together with the probability space and the noise. We give such a definition because in this way any strategy gives a unique pathwise solution to dynamics (2.9). Indeed, provided that $\tilde{f}$ is Lipschitz in p, we have pathwise existence and uniqueness of solutions to the system (2.9), for any $\alpha^N = (\alpha_1^N, \dots, \alpha_N^N) \in \mathcal{A}^N$.

Given a feedback strategy vector $\gamma^N = (\gamma_1^N, \dots, \gamma_N^N) \in \mathbb{A}^N$, equation (2.9) is written as

$$X_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, X_i^N(s^-), u, \gamma_i^N(s, X^N(s^-)), \mu^N(s^-)) \mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du) \tag{2.10}$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, N$. The same assumption as above provides existence and uniqueness of solutions X_i^N to this equation, so we can define the related open-loop control $\alpha^N[\gamma^N]$ by

$$\alpha^N[\gamma^N]_i(s) = \gamma_i^N(s, X^N(s^-)). \tag{2.11}$$

In view of Definition 1, the open-loop control $\alpha^N[\gamma^N]$ has to be given together with a filtered probability space, a vector of initial conditions and a vector of Poisson random measures, which we impose to be the same that are given with the feedback control γ^N.

Next, we define the object of the minimization. Let $\alpha^N = (\alpha_1^N, \dots, \alpha_N^N) \in \mathcal{A}^N$ be a strategy vector and $X^N = (X_i^N, \dots, X_N^N)$ be the solution to dynamics (2.9). For $i = 1, \dots, N$ set

$$J_i^N(\alpha^N) := E\left[\int_0^T c(t, X_i^N(t), \alpha_i^N(t), \mu^N(t))dt + \Psi(X_i^N(T), \mu^N(T))\right]. \tag{2.12}$$

Define also $J_i^N(\gamma^N) := J_i^N(\alpha^N[\gamma^N])$ for any $\gamma^N \in \mathbb{A}^N$.

We look for *approximate* Nash equilibria for the N-player game. So let us define what are the perturbed strategy vectors we consider.

Notation 1. *Let β be an A-valued $\mathbb{F}$-predictable process. For a strategy vector $\alpha^N = (\alpha_1^N, \dots, \alpha_N^N) \in \mathcal{A}^N$ denote by $[\alpha^{N,-i}; \beta]$ the strategy vector such that*

$$[\alpha^{N,-i}; \beta]_j = \begin{cases} \alpha_j^N & j \neq i \\ \beta & j = i. \end{cases}$$

For a feedback strategy vector $\gamma^N = (\gamma_1^N, \dots, \gamma_N^N) \in \mathbb{A}^N$, let $\widetilde{X}^N$ be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{X}_i^N(t) = & \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, \widetilde{X}_i^N(s^-), u, \beta(s), \widetilde{\mu}_N(s^-)) \mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du) \\ \widetilde{X}_j^N(t) = & \xi_j^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, \widetilde{X}_j^N(s^-), u, \gamma_j^N(s, \widetilde{X}^N(s^-)), \widetilde{\mu}_N(s^-)) \mathcal{N}_j^N(ds, du) \\ & \text{if } j \neq i. \end{cases}$$

Denote then by $[\gamma^{N,-i}; \beta] \in \mathcal{A}^N$ the strategy vector such that

$$[\gamma^{N,-i}; \beta]_j(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma_j^N(t, \widetilde{X}_j^N(t^-)) & j \neq i \\ \beta(t) & j = i. \end{cases}$$

Definition 2. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. A strategy vector α_N is said to be an ε-*Nash equilibrium *if for each $i = 1, \dots, N$*

$$J_i^N(\alpha^N) \leq J_N^i([\alpha^{N,-i}; \beta]) + \varepsilon \tag{2.13}$$

for every β such that $[\alpha^{N,-i}; \beta]$ is a strategy vector.

A vector $\gamma^N \in \mathbb{A}^N$ is called a feedback *ε-Nash equilibrium if*

$$J_i^N(\gamma^N) \leq J_N^i([\gamma^{N,-i}; \beta]) + \varepsilon \tag{2.14}$$

for every β such that $[\gamma^{N,-i}; \beta]$ is a strategy vector.

We remark that the above definition (2.14) of feedback ε-Nash equilibrium is not standard. Indeed the perturbed strategy vector $[\gamma^{N,-i}; \beta]$ is usually understood to be only in feedback form. In our definition, a slightly more restrictive (or stronger) condition is used since the perturbing strategy β is allowed to be in open-loop form.

2.3. **Mean field game.** The *mean field* limiting system consists of a single player whose state evolves according to the dynamics

$$X(t) = \xi + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, X(s^-), u, \alpha(s), m(s))\mathcal{N}(ds, du), \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.15}$$

Here the empirical measure appearing in (2.9) is replaced by a deterministic *flow* of probability measures $m : [0,T] \longrightarrow S$.

Definition 3. *The set of* open-loop controls *is the set*

$$\mathcal{A} := \{((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \alpha, \xi, \mathcal{N})\}$$

where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F})$ is a filtered probability space, ξ is a random variable with law m_0, the initial condition, $\mathcal{N}$ is a Poisson random measure with intensity ν on U, whose filtration is in $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$, $\mathcal{F}_T = \mathcal{F}$, and α is a measurable and $\mathbb{F}$-predictable process. We will often write $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ to indicate the process α.

Define also the set of feedback controls *as*

$$\mathbb{A} := \{((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \gamma, \xi, \mathcal{N})\}$$

where $\gamma : [0,T] \times \Sigma \to A$ is measurable and the filtered probability space, the initial condition and the Poisson random measure $\mathcal{N}$ are as above. We will often write $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}$ to indicate the function γ.

We remark that the feedback control is given with the probability space and the noise, in analogy with Definition 1 for the prelimit system. Thanks to the Lipschitz condition (2.1), the limiting dynamics is well defined. More precisely, given any open-loop control $((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \alpha, \xi, \mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{A}$ and flow of measures $m \in \mathcal{L}$, there exists a pathwise unique solution X of Eq. (2.15), which we will denote by $X_{\alpha,m}$.

Similarly, given any feedback control $((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \gamma, \xi, \mathcal{N}) \in \mathbb{A}$ and flow of measures $m \in \mathcal{L}$, there exists a pathwise unique process $X = X_{\gamma,m}$ solving

$$X(t) = \xi + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, X(s^-), u, \gamma(s, X(s^-)), m(s))\mathcal{N}(ds, du), \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.16}$$

The corresponding open-loop control is then defined as

$$\alpha^\gamma(t) := \gamma(t, X_{\gamma,m}(t^-)). \tag{2.17}$$

In view of Definition 3, the open-loop control α^γ has to be given together with a filtered probability space, an initial condition and a Poisson random measure, which we impose to be the same that are given with the feedback control γ.

We define the object of the minimization for the mean field game. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m \in \mathcal{L}$ let

$$J(\alpha, m) := E\left[\int_0^T c(s, X_{\alpha,m}(s), \alpha(s), m(s))ds + \psi(X_{\alpha,m}(T), m(T))\right]. \tag{2.18}$$

Define also $J(\gamma, m) := J(\alpha^\gamma, m)$ for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}$.

The notion of solution for the limiting mean field game, which will provide approximate Nash equilibria for the N-player game, is the following.

Definition 4. *An* open-loop solution of the mean field game (2.15) *is a triple*

$$(((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \alpha, \xi, \mathcal{N}), m, X)$$

such that

1. $((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \alpha, \xi, \mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{A}$, $m \in \mathcal{L}$, $(X(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ *is adapted to the filtration* $\mathbb{F}$ *and* $X = X_{\alpha,m}$*;*
2. Optimality*:* $J(\alpha, m) \le J(\beta, m)$ *for every* $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$*;*
3. Mean Field Condition*:* $Law(X(t)) = m(t)$ *for every* $t \in [0,T]$.

We say that $(((\Omega,\mathcal{F},P;\mathbb{F}),\gamma,\xi,\mathcal{N}),m,X)$ *is a* feedback solution of the mean field game *if* $\gamma\in\mathbb{A}$ *and* $(((\Omega,\mathcal{F},P;\mathbb{F}),\alpha^\gamma,\xi,\mathcal{N}),m,X)$ *is an open-loop solution of the mean field game, where* α^γ *is defined in (2.17).*

In our writing, we will often drop the filtered probability space and the Poisson random measure from the notation.

In condition (3) of the above definition, $Law(X(t)) := P\circ X(t)^{-1}$ as usual. Let us denote by $Flow(X):[0,T]\longrightarrow S$ the *flow* of the process X, that is, $Flow(X).t := Law(X(t))$. Then the mean field condition can be written as $Flow(X)=m$.

2.4. **Relaxed controls.** The space $\mathcal{A}$ is not itself compact. In order to always have convergence along subsequences, we need to enlarge the space of controls, considering relaxed controls and related relaxed Poisson measures. They are used only for the limiting system.

Definition 5. *A* deterministic relaxed control *is a measure* ρ *on the Borel sets* $\mathcal{B}([0,T]\times A)$ *such that*

$$\rho([0,t[\times A)=\rho([0,t]\times A)=t\quad\forall t\in[0,T]. \tag{2.19}$$

The space of deterministic relaxed controls will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}$.

Given $\rho\in\mathcal{D}$, the time derivative exists for Lebesgue-almost every $t\in[0,T]$; it is the probability measure ρ_t on A given by

$$\rho_t(E) := \lim_{\delta\to 0}\frac{\rho([t-\delta,t]\times E)}{\delta},\quad E\in\mathcal{B}(A). \tag{2.20}$$

As a consequence, ρ can be factorized according to

$$\rho(dt,da)=\rho_t(da)dt. \tag{2.21}$$

The space $\mathcal{D}$ is endowed with the topology of weak convergence of measures, i.e. $\rho_n\to\rho$ if and only if

$$\int_0^T\int_A\varphi(s,a)\rho_n(ds,da)\quad\longrightarrow\quad\int_0^T\int_A\varphi(s,a)\rho(ds,da) \tag{2.22}$$

for every continuous φ on $[0,T]\times A$. Moreover there exists a metric which makes $\mathcal{D}$ a compact metric space (for instance, Kushner and Dupuis, 2001).

Definition 6. *The space of* (stochastic) relaxed controls *is*

$$\mathcal{R}=\{((\Omega,\mathcal{F},P;\mathbb{F}),\rho,\xi,\mathcal{N})\}$$

where $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P;\mathbb{F})$ *is a filtered probability space,* ρ *is a random variable with values in* $\mathcal{D}$ *such that* $\rho(\cdot,\omega)$ *is a deterministic relaxed control* P*-almost surely and* $\rho([0,t]\times E)$ *is* $\mathcal{F}_t$*-adapted for all* $E\in\mathcal{B}(A)$*, and* $\mathcal{N}$ *is a Poisson random measure with intensity* ν *on* U *whose filtration is in* $\mathbb{F}$*. We will often write* $\rho\in\mathcal{R}$ *to denote the process* ρ.

The space of relaxed feedback controls *is the set*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{A}} := \{((\Omega,\mathcal{F},P;\mathbb{F}),\widehat{\gamma},\xi,\mathcal{N})\}$$

where $\widehat{\gamma}:[0,T]\times\Sigma\longrightarrow\mathcal{P}(A)$ *is measurable,* $\mathcal{P}(A)$ *is endowed with the topology of weak convergence, and the filtered probability space, the initial condition and the Poisson random measure are as above. We will often write* $\widehat{\gamma}\in\widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ *to denote the process* $\widehat{\gamma}$.

The relaxed feedback control is given with the probability space and the noise, in analogy with Definition 3. Because of (2.20), the derivative $(\rho_t(E))_{0\le t\le T}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-predictable process for any $E\in\mathcal{B}(A)$. An ordinary open-loop control $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$ can

be viewed as a relaxed control $\rho^\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$ in which the derivative in time is a Dirac measure:

$$\rho^\alpha(E \times [0,t]) = \int_0^t \rho_s^\alpha(E)ds = \int_0^t \delta_{\alpha(s)}(E)ds.$$

We also have to introduce the corresponding *relaxed Poisson measure* in order to have well-defined dynamics. This will be done properly in Appendix A. Given any $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, Borel sets $U_0 \subseteq U$, $A_0 \subseteq A$, the relaxed Poisson measure N_ρ related to the relaxed control ρ has the property that the processes

$$\mathcal{N}_\rho(t, U_0, A_0) - \nu(U_0)\rho(t, A_0) \tag{2.23}$$

are $\mathbb{F}$-martingales, and are orthogonal for disjoint $U_0 \times A_0$. This martingale property and the fact that N_ρ is a counting measure valued process define the distribution of N_ρ and the joint law of $(\mathcal{N}_\rho, \rho, \xi, \mathcal{N})$ uniquely (see Appendix A). The martingale property (2.23) also implies that the process

$$\int_0^t \int_U \int_A \varphi(s,u,a)\mathcal{N}_\rho(ds,du,da) - \int_0^t \int_U \int_A \varphi(s,u,a)\nu(du)\rho_s(da)ds \tag{2.24}$$

is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale, for any bounded and measurable φ. For an ordinary control $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ (or the relaxed control it induces), the corresponding relaxed Poisson measure is explicitly given by

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha(t, U_0, A_0) := \int_0^t \int_{U_0} \mathbb{1}_{A_0}(\alpha(s))\mathcal{N}(ds,du). \tag{2.25}$$

The stochastic differential equation (2.15) in this more general framework with a relaxed Poisson measure is written as

$$X(t) = \xi + \int_0^t \int_U \int_A f(s, X(s^-), u, a, m(s))\mathcal{N}_\rho(ds,du,da) \tag{2.26}$$

for any relaxed control $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ and $m \in \mathcal{L}$.

Given a relaxed feedback control $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ and a process X, define the corresponding relaxed open-loop control through

$$\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}(dt,da) := [\widehat{\gamma}(t, X(t^-))](da)dt. \tag{2.27}$$

Let $\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}}$ be the relaxed Poisson measure corresponding to $\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}$. Equation (2.26) then becomes

$$X(t) = \xi + \int_0^t \int_U \int_A f(s, X(s^-), u, a, m(s))\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}}(ds,du,da), \tag{2.28}$$

where the solution process X appears also in the relaxed Poisson measure.

The proof of the following lemma is done in Appendix A.1.

Lemma 1. *For any $m \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, respectively $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$, there exists a pathwise unique solution to the stochastic differential equation (2.26), respectively (2.28).*

The solutions to (2.26) and (2.28) will be denoted by $X_{\rho,m}$ and $X_{\widehat{\gamma},m}$ respectively. For $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$, let $\rho^{\widehat{\gamma}}$ denote the corresponding relaxed control defined by (2.27), that is, $\rho^{\widehat{\gamma}}$ is the relaxed open-loop control such that

$$\rho_t^{\widehat{\gamma}}(da) := [\widehat{\gamma}(t, X_{\widehat{\gamma},m}(t^-))](da). \tag{2.29}$$

In view of Definition 6, the relaxed open-loop control $\rho^{\widehat{\gamma}}$ has to be given together with a filtered probability space, an initial condition and a Poisson random measure, which we impose to be the same as those coming with the relaxed feedback control $\widehat{\gamma}$.

Let $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ and $m \in \mathcal{L}$. Let $X = X_{\rho,m}$. Thanks to the martingale property (2.24), we obtain that the process

(2.30)

$$M_g(t) = g(X(t)) - g(X(0)) - \int_0^t \int_U \int_A \left[g(X(s) + f(s, X(s), u, a, m(s))) - g(X(s))\right] \nu(du)\rho_s(da)ds$$

is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale, for any $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This yields the Dynkin formula

(2.31)

$$E[g(X(t))] - E[g(\xi)] = E \int_0^t \int_U \int_A \left[g(X(s) + f(s, X(s), u, a, m(s))) - g(X(s))\right] \nu(du)\rho_s(da)ds.$$

The cost to be minimized is

(2.32)

$$J(\rho, m) := E\left[\int_0^T \int_A c(s, X_{\rho,m}(s), a, m(s))\rho_s(da)ds + \psi(X_{\rho,m}(T), m(T))\right].$$

Define also $J(\widehat{\gamma}, m) := J(\rho^{\widehat{\gamma}}, m)$ for $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$. The definitions of *relaxed solution* of the mean field game (2.26) and *relaxed feedback solution* are analogous to Definition 4, where ordinary controls are replaced by relaxed controls.

Definition 7. *A* relaxed solution of the mean field game (2.15) *is a triple*

$$\left(((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \rho, \xi, \mathcal{N}), m, X\right)$$

such that

1. $((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \rho, \xi, \mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{R}$, $m \in \mathcal{L}$, $(X(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ *is adapted to the filtration* $\mathbb{F}$ *and* $X = X_{\rho,m}$*;*
2. Optimality*:* $J(\rho, m) \leq J(\sigma, m)$ *for every* $\sigma \in \mathcal{R}$*;*
3. Mean Field Condition*:* $Law(X(t)) = m(t)$ *for every* $t \in [0, T]$.

We say that $\left(((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \widehat{\gamma}, \xi, \mathcal{N}), m, X\right)$ *is a* relaxed feedback solution of the mean field game *if* $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ *and* $\left(\left((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \rho^{\widehat{\gamma}}, \xi, \mathcal{N}\right), m, X\right)$ *is a relaxed solution of the mean field game, where* $\rho^{\widehat{\gamma}}$ *is defined in (2.29).*

In our writing, we will often drop the filtered probability space and the Poisson random measure from the notation.

In Section 3.2 we will show the existence of relaxed mean field game solutions via a fixed point argument, while existence of a relaxed feedback mean field game solution is established in Section 3.3. In Section 4, under additional assumptions, we will prove existence of feedback mean field game solutions (not relaxed); such solutions will be shown to be unique if the time horizon is small.

2.5. **Example.** We show how our assumptions are satisfied for a natural shape of the function f for which, when considering α and m constants, the transition rates of the Markov chain X solution of the dynamics (2.15) appear explicitly. Consider then f defined by

$$f(t, x, u) := \sum_{y\in\Sigma} (y - x)\mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(t,x,y)[}(u_y) \tag{2.33}$$

and the intensity measure ν on $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ defined by

$$\nu(E) := \sum_{y=1}^{d} \ell(E \cap U_y), \quad E \in \mathcal{B}(U), \tag{2.34}$$

where ℓ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ and $U_y := \{u \in U : u_z = 0 \quad \forall z \neq y\}$.

The function λ appearing in (2.33) yields the transition rates of the Markov chain X solution of (2.15), that is, for $x \neq y$, as $h \to 0$,

$$P\left[X(t+h) = y | X(t) = x\right] = \lambda(t,x,y) \cdot h + o(h). \tag{2.35}$$

Moreover, the measure ν defined in (2.34) has the property that

$$\int_U \varphi(u_1, \dots, u_d)\nu(du) = \sum_{y=1}^{d} \int_{U_y} \varphi(0, \dots, u_y, \dots, 0) du_y \tag{2.36}$$

for any bounded and measurable $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In particular,

$$\int_U \sum_{y=1}^{d} \varphi_y(u_y)\nu(du) = \sum_{y=1}^{d} \int_{U_y} \varphi_y(u_y) du_y \tag{2.37}$$

for any function $\varphi_y : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi_y(0) = 0$, $y \in \Sigma$.

If we want f to depend also on a control and a flow of measures we may consider the rate λ to depend also on $a \in A$ and $p \in S$, so that (2.33) is rewritten as

$$f(t,x,u,a,p) := \sum_{y \in \Sigma} (y - x) \mathbb{1}_{]0, \lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y). \tag{2.38}$$

We also assume that λ is bounded by a constant M (which holds a posteriori by the assumptions of the next lemma) and $U := [0, M]^d$. With this f, (2.35) becomes

$$P\left[X(t+h) = y | X(t) = x\right] = E[\lambda(t,x,y,\alpha(t), m(t))] \cdot h + o(h), \tag{2.39}$$

where $X = X_{\alpha,m}$ is the solution of (2.15) under the control $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and flow of measures $m \in \mathcal{L}$. A proof of (2.35), (2.36) and (2.39) can be found in Turchi (2015), where the examples (2.33) and (2.38) were introduced.

Let us check whether our assumptions on the model are satisfied for such an f.

Lemma 2. *Let f be defined by (2.38) and ν by (2.34).*

- *If the rate λ appearing in (2.38) is continuous in t, a and p then (A) holds;*
- *If in addition λ is Lipschitz in p then (A') holds;*
- *If in addition λ is Lipschitz also in a then (A") holds.*

Proof. Let $t, s \in [0,T]$, $a, b \in A$, $p, q \in S$ and fix $x \in \Sigma$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_U |f(t,x,u,a,p) - f(s,x,u,b,q)|\nu(du) \\
&\qquad = \int_U \left| \sum_{y \in \Sigma} (y - x) \left[\mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y) - \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(s,x,y,b,q)[}(u_y) \right] \right| \nu(du) \\
&\qquad \leq \int_U \sum_{y \neq x} |y - x| \left| \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y) - \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(s,x,y,b,q)[}(u_y) \right| \nu(du) \\
&\qquad \leq 2d \int_U \sum_{y \neq x} \left| \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y) - \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(s,x,y,b,q)[}(u_y) \right| \nu(du).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.37) this is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&2d \sum_{y \neq x} \int_U \left| \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y) - \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(s,x,y,b,q)[}(u_y) \right| du_y \\
&\qquad = 2d \sum_{y \neq x} |\lambda(t,x,y,a,p) - \lambda(s,x,y,b,q)|,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the claims. □

In order to verify assumptions (C) and (D) we need additional hypotheses on the structure of the model. So assume that A is a compact and convex metric topological vector space.

Lemma 3. *Let f be defined by (2.38) and ν by (2.34). Let the running cost c be strictly convex and the rate λ appearing in (2.38) be linear in a. Then assumption (C) is satisfied.*

If $\lambda(t,x,y,a,p) \geq \kappa$ for some $\kappa > 0$ then (D) is satisfied.

Proof. We have $H(t,x,a,p,g) = \Lambda_t^{a,p} g(x) + c(t,x,a,p)$ where

$$\Lambda_t^{a,p} g(x) = \int_U \left[g\left(x + \sum_{y \in \Sigma} (y-x) \mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y) \right) - g(x) \right] \nu(du).$$

Applying formula (2.36) we obtain

$$\Lambda_t^{a,p} g(x) = \sum_{y=1}^{d} \int_{U_y} \left[g(x + (y-x)\mathbb{1}_{]0,\lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y)) - g(x) \right] du_y$$

$$= \sum_{y=1}^{d} \lambda(t,x,y,a,p) \left[g(y) - g(x) \right],$$

which is a linear function of a if λ is linear in a. Therefore H is a strictly convex function of a, if c is strictly convex, and thus it has a unique minimum in A.

The fact that λ bounded away from zero implies (D) is well known. □

3. Relaxed Mean Field Game Solutions

3.1. **The space $\mathcal{L}$.** In order to prove the existence of solutions we use a fixed point theorem. First of all, we want to find a suitable space where all the flows of probability measures lie. Set $K := 2\nu(U)\sqrt{d}$ and denote by

$$\mathcal{L} := \{ m : [0,T] \longrightarrow S : |m(t) - m(s)| \leq K|t-s|, \quad m(0) = m_0 \} \tag{3.1}$$

the space of Lipschitz continuous flows of probability measures, with the same Lipschitz constant K and initial point m_0. This space is easily seen to be convex and compact with respect to the uniform norm, applying Ascoli-Arzelà theorem. The following lemma allows to restrict attention to flows of probability measures in $\mathcal{L}$.

Lemma 4. *Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, or $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, and let $m : [0,T] \longrightarrow S$ be any deterministic flow of probability measures. Then the flow of the solution process $Flow(X_{\alpha,m})$, or $Flow(X_{\rho,m})$, is in $\mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. We prove the claim for relaxed controls, so the conclusion follows also when considering the subset of ordinary controls. Let $g : \Sigma \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function, which is then Lipschitz and bounded and can be viewed as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Denote $|g|_\infty := \max_{x \in \Sigma} g(x)$. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ and m be fixed, and set $X = X_{\rho,m}$. The function $m : [0,T] \to S$ has a priori no regularity. By the Dynkin formula (2.31) we have, for any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$,

$$E[g(X(t))] - E[g(X(s))]$$
$$= \int_s^t \int_U \int_A E[g(X(r) + f(r, X(r), u, a, m(r))) - g(X(r))] \rho_r(da) \nu(du) ds.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&|E[g(X(t))] - E[g(X(s))]| \\
&\qquad \le \int_s^t \int_U \int_A E|g(X(r) + f(r, X(r), u, a, m(r))) - g(X(r))| \rho_r(da)\nu(du)ds \\
&\qquad \le \int_s^t \int_U \int_A 2|g|_\infty \rho_r(da)\nu(du)ds = 2\nu(U)|g|_\infty (t-s)
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to the fact that ρ_r is a probability measure on A for any r. Clearly, $E[g(X(t))] = g \cdot Law(X(t))$. Thus, for any t and s,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Law(X(t)) - Law(X(s))| &= \sqrt{\sum_{x=1}^d \left[e_x \cdot (Law(X(t)) - Law(X(s)))\right]^2} \\
&\le \sqrt{\sum_{x=1}^d |t-s|^2 4|e_x|_\infty \nu(U)^2} = 2\nu(U)\sqrt{d}|t-s|,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the claim.

□

3.2. **Existence of relaxed mean field game solutions.**

3.2.1. *Tightness and continuity for m fixed.* Consider a sequence of random variables

$$(X^n, \rho^n, \mathcal{N}_{\rho^n}) \tag{3.2}$$

where ρ^n is a relaxed control, $\mathcal{N}_{\rho^n}$ is the related relaxed Poisson measure and $X^n = X_{\rho^n,m}$, $m \in \mathcal{L}$ is fixed. The state space of these random variables is $D([0,T],\Sigma) \times \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}([0,T] \times U \times A)$ denotes the set of finite positive measures on $[0,T] \times U \times A$ endowed with the topology of weak convergence.

The following is of fundamental importance, and is similar to Theorem 13.2.1 in Kushner and Dupuis (2001, p. 363).

Theorem 1. *Assume (A) and (B). Then*

1. *any sequence of the form (3.2) is tight;*
2. *the limit in distribution $(X, \rho, \mathcal{N}_\rho)$ of any converging subsequence is such that $\mathcal{N}_\rho$ is the relaxed Poisson measure related to the relaxed control ρ and $X = X_{\rho,m}$;*
3. *$J(\rho, m)$ is continuous in ρ.*

Proof. (1) The sequence of relaxed controls is tight as $\mathcal{D}$ is compact. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, the set

$$K_\varepsilon := \left\{ \Theta \in \mathcal{M} : \Theta([0,T] \times U \times A) \le \frac{T\nu(U)}{\varepsilon} \right\}$$

is compact in $\mathcal{M}$, since $[0,T] \times U \times A$ is compact. From (2.19) and the martingale property (2.23), it follows that $N_{\rho^n}(t,U,A) - t\nu(U)$ is a martingale for any n and so $E[\mathcal{N}_{\rho^n}(T,U,A)] = T\nu(U)$. Therefore, by Chebychev's inequality,

$$P\left(\mathcal{N}_{\rho^n} \notin K_\varepsilon\right) = P\left(\mathcal{N}_{\rho^n}(T,U,A) > \frac{T\nu(U)}{\varepsilon}\right) \le E[\mathcal{N}_{\rho^n}(T,U,A)] \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{T\nu(U)} = \varepsilon$$

for any n, saying that the sequence of relaxed Poisson measures is tight. The properties of the stochastic integral give

$$E\left[\,|X^n(\tau+h) - X^n(\tau)|^2 \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau\right] = O(h)$$

for any $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time τ, uniformly in n, which implies the tightness of the processes in $D([0,T],\Sigma)$ by Aldous's criterion (Aldous, 1978).

(2) By abuse of notations, denote by $(X^n, \rho^n, \mathcal{N}_{\rho^n})$ the subsequence which converges in distribution to $(X, \rho, \mathcal{N})$. From the martingale property (2.23) follows that $\mathcal{N}(t, U_0, A_0) - \nu(U_0)\rho(t, A_0)$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale for any t and Borel sets $A_0 \subset A$ and $U_0 \subset U$. The limit random measure $\mathcal{N}$ is integer valued (Theorem 15.7.4 in Kallenberg, 1986) and so the uniqueness property says that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_\rho$. The claim $X = X_{\rho,m}$ will be shown also in the proof of Theorem (2) where m is not fixed, using the controlled martingale problem, so we do not repeat the argument here.

(3) $\lim_{n\to\infty} J(\rho_n, m) = J(\rho, m)$ since c and ψ are bounded and continuous by assumption (B).

□

By the Chattering lemma, which we will present later as Lemma 7, we have

$$\min_{\rho\in\mathcal{R}} J(\rho, m) = \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} J(\alpha, m). \tag{3.3}$$

The minimum on the left hand side exists by the above Theorem 1. The infimum on the right hand side is actually a minimum, too; see Theorem 4 below, where the existence of optimal feedback controls will be shown. However, there might exist more optima among relaxed open-loop controls than among ordinary feedback controls.

3.2.2. *Fixed point argument.* Let $2^{\mathcal{L}}$ be the set of subsets of $\mathcal{L}$ and define the point-to-set map $\Phi : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow 2^{\mathcal{L}}$ by

$$\Phi(m) := \{Flow(X_{\rho,m}) : J(\rho, m) \le J(\sigma, m) \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{R}\}, \quad m \in \mathcal{L}. \tag{3.4}$$

A flow $m \in \mathcal{L}$ is called a *fixed point* of this point-to-set map if $m \in \Phi(m)$. We need this map since the optimal control is not necessarily unique.

By construction, Φ has a fixed point if and only if there exists a relaxed solution to the mean field game, in the sense of Definition 7. In order to prove the existence of a fixed point, we are going to apply Theorem 1 in Fan (1952), which requires the following definition.

Definition 8. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a metric space. A map $\Phi : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow 2^{\mathcal{L}}$ is said to have* closed graph *if $m_n \in \mathcal{L}$, $y_n \in \mathcal{L}$, $y_n \in \Phi(m_n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m_n \to m$, $y_n \to y$ in $\mathcal{L}$ implies $y \in \Phi(m)$.*

Proposition 1 (Ky Fan)**.** *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a non empty, compact and convex subset of a locally convex metric topological vector space. Let $\Phi : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow 2^{\mathcal{L}}$ have closed graph and assume that $\Phi(m)$ is non empty and convex for any $m \in \mathcal{L}$. Then the set of fixed points of Φ is non empty and compact.*

By means of this proposition we are now able to state and prove the following main theorem concerning existence of relaxed solutions, while uniqueness is not guaranteed.

Theorem 2. *Under assumptions (A) and (B) there exists at least one relaxed solution of the mean field game (2.26).*

Proof. We want to show the existence of a fixed point for the map $\Phi : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow 2^{\mathcal{L}}$ defined in (3.4), applying Proposition 1. Recall that any m is in $\mathcal{L}$ by lemma 4, and the set $\mathcal{L}$ defined in (3.1) is a compact and convex subset of $\mathcal{C}([0, T], S)$ endowed with the uniform norm. By Theorem 1 $\Phi(m)$ is non empty for any m. It remains to prove that $\Phi(m)$ is convex and Φ has closed graph.

$\Phi(m)$ **is convex**. Let $m \in \mathcal{L}$ be fixed and let $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ be such that $Flow(X_{\rho_1,m})$ and $Flow(X_{\rho_2,m})$ belong to $\Phi(m)$, i.e. ρ_1 and ρ_2 are optimal controls for m, and

take $\theta \in [0,1]$. Let ζ be a Bernoulli random variable with parameter θ, $\mathcal{F}_0$ measurable and independent of ρ_1 and ρ_2. Define $\rho_3 \in \mathcal{R}$ by

$$\rho_3([0,t[\times E) := \rho_1([0,t[\times E)\mathbb{1}_{\{\zeta=1\}} + \rho_2([0,t[\times E)\mathbb{1}_{\{\zeta=0\}}$$

for any $E \in \mathcal{B}(A)$ and $t \in [0,T]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} E[G(X_{\rho_3,m})] &= E\left[G(X_{\rho_3,m})|\,\zeta=1\right]P(\zeta=1) + E\left[G(X_{\rho_3,m})|\,\zeta=0\right]P(\zeta=0) \\ &= \theta E[G(X_{\rho_1,m})] + (1-\theta)E[G(X_{\rho_2,m})] \end{aligned}$$

for every $G \in \mathcal{C}_b(D([0,T],\Sigma),\mathbb{R})$. This implies that

$$Law(X_{\rho_3,m}) = \theta Law(X_{\rho_1,m}) + (1-\theta)Law(X_{\rho_2,m}) \tag{3.5}$$

and then in particular

$$Flow(X_{\rho_3,m}) = \theta Flow(X_{\rho_1,m}) + (1-\theta)Flow(X_{\rho_2,m}). \tag{3.6}$$

Since ρ_1 and ρ_2 are optimal for m we have, thanks to (3.5),

$$\begin{aligned} J(\rho_3,m) &= J(\rho_1,m)P(\zeta=1) + J(\rho_2,m)P(\zeta=0) \\ &\le \theta J(\sigma,m) + (1-\theta)J(\sigma,m) = J(\sigma,m) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{R}$, which means that also ρ_3 is optimal for m and hence (3.6) says that $\Phi(m)$ is convex.

Φ has closed graph. Let $m_n, y_n, m, y \in \mathcal{L}$ be such that $m_n \to m$, $y_n \to y$ in $\mathcal{L}$ and $y_n \in \Phi(m_n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We have to prove that $y \in \Phi(m)$. Let $\rho_n \in \mathcal{R}$ be optimal for m_n and such that $y_n = Flow(X_{\rho_n,m_n})$. Set $X_n := X_{\rho_n,m_n}$ and let $\mathcal{N}_n := \mathcal{N}_{\rho_n}$ be the relaxed Poisson measure related to ρ_n.

The tightness of the sequence $(X_n, \rho_n, \mathcal{N}_n)$ is proved as in Theorem 1. Let $(X_{n_k}, \rho_{n_k}, \mathcal{N}_{n_k})$ be a subsequence which converges in distribution to $(X, \rho, \mathcal{N})$. We have $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_\rho$, i.e. it is the relaxed Poisson measure related to ρ. In order to prove that $X = X_{\rho,m}$, we use the controlled martingale problem formulation: X solves equation (2.26) in distribution if and only if the process $M_g^X(t)$ defined in (2.30) is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale for any $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This holds if and only if

$$E\left[h(X(t_i); i \le j)(M_g(t+s) - M_g(t))\right] = 0 \tag{3.7}$$

for every $h : \Sigma^j \to \mathbb{R}$ and every choice of j, t, s, t_i, $i = 1, \dots, j$ such that $0 \le t_i \le t \le t+s$.

Property 3.7 holds for X_{n_k}, ρ_{n_k} and m_{n_k}, any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $M_g^{n_k}$ denote the process defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &M_g^{n_k}(t) = g(X_{n_k}(t)) - g(X_{n_k}(0)) \\ &- \int_0^t \int_U \int_A \left[g(X_{n_k}(s) + f(s, X_{n_k}(s), u, a, m_{n_k}(s))) - g(X_{n_k}(s))\right] \nu(du)\rho_s^{n_k}(da)ds, \end{aligned}$$

for any $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The convergence in distribution of the sequence $(X_{n_k}, \rho_{n_k}, \mathcal{N}_{n_k})$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{k\to\infty} E\left[h(X_{n_k}(t_i); i \le j)(M_g^{n_k}(t+s) - M_g^{n_k}(t))\right] \\ &\qquad = E\left[h(X(t_i); i \le j)(M_g(t+s) - M_g(t))\right] \end{aligned}$$

thanks to continuity assumption (A), uniform convergence of m_n and (2.22). Therefore we have proved that $X = X_{\rho,m}$ in distribution.

Thus we obtain

$$\lim_k Law(X_{n_k}) = Law(X_{\rho,m}) \tag{3.8}$$

which implies the convergence

$$\lim_k \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |Law(X_k(t)) - Law(X(t))| = 0,$$

that is, $Flow(X_{n_k}) \to Flow(X)$ uniformly. The convergence is then proved along a subsequence, but by hypothesis the limit $Flow(X_n) \to y$ exists in $\mathcal{L}$, hence $y = Flow(X) = Flow(X_{\rho,m})$.

It remains to prove that ρ is optimal for m. Again the convergence in distribution of the sequence $(X_{n_k}, \rho_{n_k}, \mathcal{N}_{n_k})$ implies that $\lim_k J(\rho_{n_k}, m_{n_k}) = J(\rho, m)$ thanks to continuity assumption (B), uniform convergence of m_n and (2.22). Then from the optimality of ρ_n for m_n, i.e. $J(\rho_{n_k}, m_{n_k}) \leq J(\sigma, m_{n_k})$ for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{R}$, taking the limit as $k \to \infty$ we get $J(\rho, m) \leq J(\sigma, m)$ for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{R}$, which means that ρ is optimal for m and thus $y = Flow(X_{\rho,m}) \in \Phi(m)$ as required.

□

3.3. **Relaxed feedback mean field game solutions.** Theorem 2 provides a relaxed (open-loop) solution of the mean field game (2.26). Under the same assumptions we obtain here a relaxed feedback mean field game solution which has the same cost and flow of the open-loop one. This result is similar to Theorem 3.7 in Lacker (2015) and will provide approximate feedback Nash equilibria for the N-player game.

Theorem 3. *Assume (A) and (B) and let* $(((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \rho, \xi, \mathcal{N}), m, X_{\rho,m})$ *be a relaxed mean field game solution. Then there exists a relaxed feedback control* $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ *such that* $(((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{F}), \widehat{\gamma}, \xi, \mathcal{N}), m, X_{\widehat{\gamma},m})$ *is a relaxed feedback mean field game solution; namely*

$$Flow(X_{\widehat{\gamma},m}) = Flow(X_{\rho,m}) = m, \tag{3.9}$$

$$J(\widehat{\gamma}, m) = J(\rho, m). \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. The flow $m \in \mathcal{L}$ is fixed and set $X = X_{\rho,m}$. We claim that there exists a measurable function $\widehat{\gamma} : [0,T] \times \Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that

$$\widehat{\gamma}(t, X(t)) = E^P[\rho_t | X(t)] \qquad \ell \otimes P\text{-almost every } (t, \omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega. \tag{3.11}$$

This holds if and only if

$$\int_A \varphi(t, X(t), a)[\widehat{\gamma}(t, X(t))](da) = E^P\left[\varphi(t, X(t), a)\rho_t(da) \middle| X(t)\right] \tag{3.12}$$

for any bounded and measurable $\varphi : [0,T] \times \Sigma \times A \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In order to construct $\widehat{\gamma}$, define the probability measure Θ on $[0,T] \times \Sigma \times A$ by

$$\Theta(C) := \frac{1}{T} E^P \left[\int_0^T \int_A \mathbb{1}_C(t, X(t), a)\rho_t(da)dt \right], \quad C \in \mathcal{B}([0,T] \times \Sigma \times A).$$

Then build $\widehat{\gamma}$ by disintegration of Θ:

$$\Theta(dt, ds, da) = \Theta_1(dt, dx)[\widehat{\gamma}(t, x)](da) \tag{3.13}$$

where Θ_1 denotes the $[0,T] \times \Sigma$ marginal of Θ and $\widehat{\gamma} : [0,T] \times \Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ is measurable. Following Lacker (2015), we show that such $\widehat{\gamma}$ satisfies (3.12): for

every bounded and measurable $h : [0,T] \times \Sigma \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &E^P\left[\int_0^T h(t,X(t)) \int_A \varphi(t,X(t),a)[\widehat{\gamma}(t,X(t))](da)dt\right] \\ &= T \int_{[0,T]\times\Sigma} h(t,x) \int_A \varphi(t,x,a)[\widehat{\gamma}(t,x)](da)\Theta_1(dt,dx) \\ &= T \int_{[0,T]\times\Sigma\times A} h(t,x)\varphi(t,x,a)\Theta(dt,dx,da) \\ &= E^P\left[\int_0^T h(t,X(t)) \int_A \varphi(t,X(t),a)\rho_t(da)dt\right], \end{aligned}$$

which provides (3.12) thanks to Lemma 5.2 in Brunick and Shreve (2013).

Having $\widehat{\gamma}$, (3.12) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_U \int_A f(t,X(t),u,a,m(t))[\widehat{\gamma}(t,X(t))](da)\nu(du) \\ &\qquad = E^P\left[\int_U \int_A f(t,X(t),u,a,m(t))\rho_t(da)dt \,\middle|\, X(t)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

$\ell \otimes P$ almost everywhere.

Then we solve equation (2.28) in the same probability space of X, under the relaxed feedback control $\widehat{\gamma}$, and denote by $Y = X_{\widehat{\gamma},m}$ its solution. By the Dynkin formula (2.31), we have for any $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[g(X(t))\right] &= E\left[g(\xi)\right] + E\left[\int_0^t \int_A \Lambda_s^a g(X(s))\rho_s(da)ds\right] \\ &= E\left[g(\xi)\right] + E\left[\int_0^t \int_A E\left[\Lambda_s^a g(X(s))\rho_s(da)|\, X(s)\right] ds\right] \end{aligned}$$

and then thanks to (3.12)

$$E\left[g(X(t))\right] = E\left[g(\xi)\right] + E\left[\int_0^t \int_A \Lambda_s^a g(X(s))[\widehat{\gamma}(s,X(s))](da)ds\right], \tag{3.15}$$

while Dynkin's formula for Y yields

$$E\left[g(Y(t))\right] = E\left[g(\xi)\right] + E\left[\int_0^t \int_A \Lambda_s^a g(Y(s))[\widehat{\gamma}(s,Y(s))](da)ds\right]. \tag{3.16}$$

Comparing (3.15) and (3.16) we obtain that $Law(X(t))$ and $Law(Y(t))$, which are vectors in $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, satisfy the same ODE in integral form, namely

$$g \cdot \pi(t) = g \cdot Law(\xi) + \int_0^t \int_\Sigma \int_A \Lambda_s^a g(x)[\widehat{\gamma}(s,x)](da)[\pi(t)](dx)ds, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

for any $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Taking $g = e_j$, $j = 1,\dots,d$, the corresponding system of ODEs, which is clearly linear in π, has a unique absolutely continuous solution $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$, hence (3.9) is proved.

Similarly, (3.12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} J(\rho,m) &= E\left[\int_0^T \int_A c(t,X(t),a,m(t))\rho_t(da)dt + \psi(X(T),m(T))\right] \\ &= E\left[\int_0^T \int_A c(t,X(t),a,m(t))[\widehat{\gamma}(s,X(s))](da)dt + \psi(X(T),m(T))\right] \end{aligned}$$

and then we use (3.9) to conclude that

$$J(\rho, m) = E\left[\int_0^T \int_A c(t, Y(t), a, m(t))[\widehat{\gamma}(s, Y(s))](da)dt + \psi(Y(T), m(T))\right]$$
$$= J(\widehat{\gamma}, m).$$

□

4. Feedback Mean field Game Solutions

4.1. **Feedback optimal control for m fixed.** We show the existence of an optimal feedback control γ_m for $J(\alpha, m)$ for any m, using the verification theorem for the related *Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman* equation. Let $m \in \mathcal{L}$ be fixed.

For any $t \in [0, T]$, $x \in \Sigma$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ let $X_\alpha^{t,x}$ be the solution to

$$X_\alpha^{t,x}(s) = x + \int_t^s \int_U f(r^-, X_\alpha^{t,x}(r^-), u, \alpha(r), m(r))\mathcal{N}(dr, du) \tag{4.1}$$

and set

$$J(t, x, \alpha, m) := E\left[\int_t^T c(s, X_\alpha^{t,x}(s), \alpha(s), m(s))ds + \psi(X_\alpha^{t,x}(T), m(T))\right]. \tag{4.2}$$

Next, define the *value function* by

$$V_m(t, x) := \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} J(t, x, \alpha, m). \tag{4.3}$$

Recall that the generator was defined in (2.7) by

$$\Lambda_t^{a,p} g(x) := \int_U [g(x + f(t, x, u, a, p)) - g(x)]\nu(du)$$

for any t, x, a, p and $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For a function $v = v(t, x)$ the generator will be applied to the space variable, i.e. denote $\Lambda_t^{a,p} v(t, x) = \Lambda_t^{a,p} v(t, \cdot)(x)$.

Thanks to Theorem D.5 in Hernández-Lerma and Lasserre (1996) on measurable selectors, there exists a feedback control $\gamma_m \in \mathbb{A}$ (i.e. measurable) such that

$$\gamma_m(t, x) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{a \in A} \left\{\Lambda_t^{a, m(t)} V(t, x) + c(t, x, a, m(t))\right\} \tag{4.4}$$

where $V = V_m$ is the value function (4.3). Let us remark that the above minimum exists for any t and x if (A) and (B) hold, as the right hand side turns out to be a continuous function of the variable a, since the value function is trivially Lipschitz continuous in x.

Theorem 4. *Assume (A) and (B). Let $m \in \mathcal{L}$. Then the feedback control γ_m defined by (4.4) is optimal, that is, $J(\gamma_m, m) \leq J(\alpha, m)$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.*

This comes as a verification theorem. We will use the following version of Dynkin's formula:

(4.5)

$$E[g(X_\alpha^{t,x}(s))] = g(x)$$
$$+ \int_t^s \int_U E[g(X_\alpha^{t,x}(r) + f(s, X_\alpha^{t,x}(r), u, \alpha(r), m(r))) - g(X_\alpha^{t,x}(r))]\nu(du)ds.$$

for any $s \in [t, T], x \in \Sigma, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}) \equiv \mathbb{R}^d$. It is obtained either as a particular case of formula (2.31) or applying the Itô formula (Theorem II.5.1 in Ikeda and Watanabe, 1989, p. 66).

The *Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman* equation of the problem is

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t,x) + \inf_{a\in A}\left\{\Lambda_t^{a,m(t)} v(t,x) + c(t,x,a,m(t))\right\} = 0 & \text{in } [0,T[\times\Sigma \\ v(T,x) = \psi(x,m(T)) & \text{in } \Sigma \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

for a function $v\colon [0,T]\times\Sigma\to\mathbb{R}$. Let us define, for $g\in\mathbb{R}^d\equiv\{\Sigma\to\mathbb{R}\}$,

$$G(t,x,g) := \inf_{a\in A}\left\{\int_U [g(x+f(t,x,u,a,m(t))) - g(x)]\nu(du) + c(t,x,a,m(t))\right\}.$$

Since Σ is finite, we set $W_x(t) := v(t,x)$, $W(t) := (W_1(t),\dots,W_d(t))$, $F_x(t,g) := G(t,x,g)$, $F(t,g) := (F_1(t,g),\dots,F_d(t,g))$, $\Psi_x := \psi(x,m(T))$ and $\Psi := (\Psi_1(t),\dots,\Psi_d(t))$. Therefore (4.6) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}W(t) + F(t,W(t)) = 0 & [0,T[\\ W(T) = \Psi \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

which is in fact an ODE.

Define a *classical solution* to (4.7) as a function $W : [0,T] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ absolutely continuous and such that $W(t) = \Psi + \int_t^T F(s,W(s))ds$ for every $t\in[0,T]$. We apply to our problem the following Verification Theorem, which is a version of Theorem 8.1 in Fleming and Soner (2006, p. 135).

Proposition 2. *Let v be a classical solution to (4.7) and γ_m be the feedback control defined in (4.4). Then*

$$v(t,x) = J(t,x,\gamma_m,m) = V_m(t,x)$$

for any $t\in[0,T]$ and $x\in\Sigma$, where V_m is the value function (4.3).

Proof. Let $\alpha_m^{t,x}$ be the open-loop control defined by

$$\alpha_m^{t,x}(s) := \gamma_m(s, X_\alpha^{t,x}(s^-)), \tag{4.8}$$

where $X_\alpha^{t,x}$ is the solution to (4.1). The assumptions imply that

$$\alpha_m(s) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{a\in A}\left\{\Lambda_s^{a,m(s)} v(s,X(s)) + c(s,X(s),a,m(s))\right\}$$

for $\ell\otimes P$ almost all $(s,\omega)\in[t,T]\times\Omega$ (recall that ℓ denotes the Lebesgue measure on $[0.T]$). Let $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$ be any open-loop control; from (4.6) it follows that

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(s,x) + \Lambda_s^{\alpha(s),m(s)} v(s,x) + c(t,s,\alpha(s),m(s)) \geq 0$$

for any s,x,ω. Using the Dynkin formula (4.5) and the terminal condition, we get

$$\begin{aligned} v(t,x) &= E\left[v(T,X_\alpha^{t,x}(T)) - \int_t^T \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(s,X_\alpha^{t,x}(s)) + \Lambda_t^{\alpha(s)} v(s,X_\alpha^{t,x}(s))\right) ds\right] \\ &\leq E\left[\psi(X_\alpha^{t,x}(T),m(T)) + \int_t^T c(s,X_\alpha^{t,x}(s),\alpha(s),m(s))ds\right] =: J(t,x,\alpha,m). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing α by α_m all inequalities become equalities. □

We are now able to prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. In view of Proposition 2 we have just to show that there exists a classical solution to (4.7). Hence it is enough to prove that $F = F(t,w)$ is globally Lipschitz continuous in $w\in\mathbb{R}^d$, uniformly in $t\in[0,T]$. So let t be fixed and take $w,z\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and $x\in\Sigma$. Recall that

$$F_x(t,w) := \min_{a\in A}\left\{\int_U [w_{x+f(t,x,u,a,m(t)))} - w_x]\nu(du) + c(t,x,a,m(t))\right\}$$

and let b be a minimizer for $F_x(t,z)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
F_x(t,w) - F_x(t,z) &= \min_{a\in A}\left\{\int_U [w_{x+f(t,x,u,a,m(t)))} - w_x]\nu(du) + c(t,x,a,m(t))\right\} \\
&\quad - \int_U [z_{x+f(t,x,u,b,m(t)))} - z_x]\nu(du) - c(t,x,b,m(t)) \\
&\le \int_U [w_{x+f(t,x,u,b,m(t)))} - w_x]\nu(du) - \int_U [z_{x+f(t,x,u,b,m(t)))} - z_x]\nu(du) \\
&\le \int_U \left|w_{x+f(t,x,u,b,m(t)))} - w_x - z_{x+f(t,x,u,b,m(t)))} + z_x\right| \nu(du) \\
&= \int_U \left|(w-z)_{x+f(t,x,u,b,m(t)))} - (w-z)_x\right| \nu(du) \le 2\nu(U)\max_{y\in\Sigma}|(w-z)_y|\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Changing the role of w and z we obtain the converse, hence

$$|F_x(t,w) - F_x(t,z)| \le 2\nu(U)\max_{y\in\Sigma}|(w-z)_y|$$

for any x, which implies

$$\max_{x\in\Sigma}|F_x(t,w) - F_x(t,z)| \le 2\nu(U)\max_{y\in\Sigma}|(w-z)_y|\,.$$

Therefore F is Lipschitz continuous in w in the norm $||w|| = \max_{y\in\Sigma}|w_y|$ which is equivalent to the euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

□

4.2. **Uniqueness of the feedback control for m fixed.** Consider the *pre-Hamiltonian*, as defined in (2.8),

$$H(t,x,a,p,g) := \int_U [g(x + f(t,x,u,a,p)) - g(x)]\,\nu(du) + c(t,x,a,p) \tag{4.9}$$

for $(t,x,a,p) \in [0,T]\times\Sigma\times A\times S$ and $g\in\mathbb{R}^d$. We make the additional assumptions (C) and (D) and so let us recall that $a^*(t,x,p,g)$ is the unique minimizer of $H(t,x,a,p,g)$ in $a\in A$. Define for $m\in\mathcal{L}$ the feedback control

$$\gamma_m(t,x) := a^*(t,x,m(t),V_m(t,\cdot)) \tag{4.10}$$

where $V = V_m$ is the value function (4.3).

Theorem 5. *Assume (A), (B), (C) and (D). Given $m\in\mathcal{L}$, let $\sigma\in\mathcal{R}$ be any optimal relaxed control for m and let $X_{\sigma,m}$ be the corresponding solution to (2.26). Then $\sigma_t = \gamma_m(t, X_{\sigma,m}(t))$ for $\ell\otimes P$ almost every (t,ω), that is, σ corresponds to the feedback control γ_m.*

This result and the proof of Theorem 2 imply that any relaxed solution of the mean field game must correspond to a feedback solution.

Corollary 1. *Assume (A), (B), (C) and (D). Then there exists a feedback solution (γ, m, X) of the mean field game and any solution is such that its control coincides with γ_m.*

Let $Q\in\mathcal{P}(A)$ and define

$$\widetilde{H}(t,x,Q,p,g) := \int_A H(t,x,a,p,g)Q(da). \tag{4.11}$$

Lemma 5. *If H is continuous in a then*

$$\min_{Q\in\mathcal{P}(A)}\widetilde{H}(t,x,Q,p,g) = \min_{a\in A}H(t,x,a,p,g) \tag{4.12}$$

for any t, x, p and g. Moreover if (C) holds then there exists a unique $Q^* \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that

(4.13)
$$\widetilde{H}(t,x,Q^*,p,g) = \min_{Q\in\mathcal{P}(A)} \widetilde{H}(t,x,Q,p,g) = \min_{a\in A} H(t,x,a,p,g) = H(t,x,a^*,p,g)$$

and $Q^* = \delta_{a^*}$, where $a^* = a^*(t,x,p,g)$.

Proof. If H is continuous in a then $\widetilde{H}$ is continuous in $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ in the weak topology. Since $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is compact there exists a minimum: let Q^* be a minimizer. For fixed t, x, p and g we have

$$\min_{Q\in\mathcal{P}(A)} \widetilde{H}(t,x,Q,p,g) \le \min_{Q=\delta_a, a\in A} \int_A H(t,x,a,p,g)Q(da) = \min_{a\in A} H(t,x,a,p,g)$$

and

$$\min_{Q\in\mathcal{P}(A)} \int_A H(t,x,a,p,g)Q(da) \ge \min_{Q\in\mathcal{P}(A)} \int_A H(t,x,a^*,p,g)Q(da) = H(t,x,a^*,p,g),$$

which means that $\widetilde{H}(t,x,Q^*,p,g) = H(t,x,a^*,p,g)$.

Consider $H(t,x,a,p,g) - H(t,x,a^*,p,g)$ as a function of a: it is non-negative and, if (C) holds, it equals 0 if and only if $a = a^*$. So

$$0 = \tilde{H}(t,x,Q^*,p,g) - H(t,x,a^*,p,g) = \int_A \left[H(t,x,a,p,g) - H(t,x,a^*,p,g)\right] Q^*(da),$$

which implies the claim, i.e. $Q^*(\{a^*\}) = 1$.

□

Remark 1. *Note that if (C) does not hold then Q^* is supported in the set of all minimizers of H. Thus it might not be a Dirac measure. This implies that there may exists an optimal relaxed control which is not an ordinary control (even open-loop).*

In order to prove Theorem 5, set for $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$,

(4.14)
$$\widetilde{J}(t,x,\rho,m) := E^{t,x}\left[\int_t^T \int_A c(s, X_{\rho,m}(s), a, m(s))\rho_s(da)ds + \psi(X_{\rho,m}(T), m(T))\right],$$

where $X_{\rho,m}$ solves (2.26) and $E^{t,x}$ denotes the conditional expectation to the event $X_{\rho,m}(t) = x$; note that we are allowed to condition on this event only if (D) holds. Let now $m \in \mathcal{L}$ be fixed. Define the value function for the relaxed controls by

$$\widetilde{V}(t,x) := \min_{\rho\in\mathcal{R}} \widetilde{J}(t,x,\rho,m). \tag{4.15}$$

We have $\widetilde{V}(t,x) = V(t,x)$ for any t and x thanks to the chattering lemma, which we will state later as Lemma 7 [1]. Therefore the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation satisfied by $\widetilde{V}$ turns out to be the same equation (4.6) satisfied by V. We are now in the position to prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 5. If (C) holds then the minimizer of $\widetilde{H}(t,x,Q,m(t),V(t,\cdot))$ is the unique $Q^* = \delta_{a^*} \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ by Lemma 5, where $a^* = a^*(t,x,m(t),V(t,\cdot))$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{R}$ be any optimal relaxed control and denote by X_σ the corresponding optimal trajectory. Thanks to (4.6) and (4.12) we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}V(t,x) + \tilde{H}(t,x,\sigma_t,V(t,\cdot)) \ge 0$$

[1] Here only the open loop part of the chattering lemma is needed, which is well known, and so we prove it in Section 5 where we need also the feedback part.

for any t, x, ω. Hence

$$V(T, X_\sigma(T)) - \int_t^T \int_A \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial s} V(s, X_\sigma(s)) \right.$$
$$\left. + \int_U \left(V(s, X_\sigma(s) + f(s, X_\sigma(s), u, a, m(s))) - V(s, X_\sigma(s)) \right) \nu(du) \right] \sigma_s(da) ds$$
$$\leq \psi(X_\sigma(T), m(T)) + \int_t^T \int_A c(s, X_\sigma(s), a, m(s)) \rho_s(da) ds.$$

Then we condition on the event $X_{\sigma,m}(t) = x$, which has positive probability for any t, x by assumption (D):

$$V(t,x) := E_{t,x} \left\{ V(T, X_\sigma(T)) - \int_t^T \int_A \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial s} V(s, X_\sigma(s)) \right. \right.$$
$$\left. \left. + \int_U \left(V(s, X_\sigma(s) + f(s, X_\sigma(s), u, a, m(s))) - V(s, X_\sigma(s)) \right) \nu(du) \right] \rho_s(da) ds \right\}$$
$$\leq E_{t,x} \left\{ \psi(X_\sigma(T), m(T)) + \int_t^T \int_A c(s, X_\sigma(s), a, m(s)) \rho_s(da) ds \right\}$$
$$=: \tilde{J}(t, x, \sigma, m),$$

where the first equality is given by the Dynkin formula (2.31) and the second by the terminal condition. Therefore by the optimality of σ we have $\tilde{J}(t, x, \sigma, m) = V(t, x)$ and thus

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, X_\sigma(t)) + \tilde{H}(t, X_\sigma(t), \sigma_t, V(t, \cdot)) = 0$$

for $\ell \otimes P$-almost every (t, ω), which means that

$$\sigma_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(A)} \tilde{H}(t, X_{\sigma,m}(t), \sigma_t, V(t, \cdot))$$

for $\ell \otimes P$-almost every (t, ω). Hence by Lemma 5 we have $\sigma_t = \gamma_m(t, X_\sigma(t))$ for $\ell \otimes P$-almost every (t, ω).

□

4.3. **Uniqueness of the feedback MFG solution for small time.** In this subsection, we focus only on the dynamics for f in (2.38),

$$f(t, x, u, a, p) := \sum_{y \in \Sigma} (y - x) \mathbb{1}_{]0, \lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[}(u_y),$$

and ν defined in (2.34) with $U := [0, M]^d$. Moreover, we assume that $A = U$ and, for $x \neq y$,

$$\lambda(t, x, y, a, p) = a_y + \zeta(p),$$

where $\zeta : S \to \mathbb{R}$ is some Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant K_ζ such that $\zeta(p) \geq \kappa$ for some $\kappa > 0$. Since λ determines the transition rates, we set $\lambda(t, x, x, a, p) := -\sum_{y \neq x} \lambda(t, x, y, a, p)$, $x \in \Sigma$.

We assume that the cost c in the variable a is in $\mathcal{C}^1(A)$, $\nabla_a c$ is Lipschitz continuous in the variable p with Lipschitz constant K_a and c is uniformly convex, that is, there exists $\theta > 0$ such that

$$c(t, x, b, p) - c(t, x, a, p) \geq \nabla_a c(t, x, a, p) \cdot (b - a) + \theta |b - a|^2 \tag{4.16}$$

for all t, x, a, b, p.

This setup is analogous to the one considered in Gomes et al. (2013). The assumptions of Lemma 3 are satisfied and thus for any $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist a unique

minimizer $a^*(t,x,p,g)$ of $H(t,x,a,p,g)$, which in this setting becomes

$$H(t,x,a,p,g) = \sum_{y=1}^{d} \lambda(t,x,y,a,p)[g(y)-g(x)] + c(t,x,a,p) \tag{4.17}$$
$$= \sum_{y=1}^{d} (a_y + h_1(p))[g(y)-g(x)] + c(t,x,a,p).$$

The assumptions of Lemma 1 are satisfied so that (A") and (B") hold. We need a^* to be Lipschitz continuous in p and g; this fact is proved in Proposition 1 in Gomes et al. (2013). We state the result in the following

Lemma 6. *Under the above assumptions (in this subsection), the function a^* is Lipschitz continuous in p and g:*

$$|a^*(t,x,p,g) - a^*(t,x,q,g)| \leq \frac{K_a}{\theta}|p-q| \tag{4.18}$$

$$|a^*(t,x,p,g) - a^*(t,x,p,h)| \leq \frac{1}{\theta}|g-h| \tag{4.19}$$

for any t,x,p,q,g,h.

Let us fix here the filtered probability space, the initial condition and the Poisson random measure. Define $\gamma_m(t,x) = a^*(t,x,m(t),V_m(t,\cdot))$ as in (4.10): it is the unique feedback control for given flow of measures $m \in \mathcal{L}$, where $V_m(t,x)$ is the value function defined in (4.3) with respect to m. The cost functions c and ψ are uniformly bounded and so is the value function: Let us denote by M_V the maximum of its absolute value. Denote by M_ζ the maximum of ζ and fix the constants

$$C_1 := 2Md^2 + 2d\sqrt{d}M^d,$$
$$C_2 := 2d\sqrt{d}\frac{K_a}{\theta} + 2d^2K_\zeta,$$
$$C_3 := \frac{2d^2}{\theta},$$
$$C_4 := K_2 + 2dM_VK_\zeta + 2\sqrt{d}M_V\frac{K_a}{\theta} + K_2\frac{K_a}{\theta},$$
$$C_5 := 2M_V\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\theta} + \frac{K_2}{\theta} + \sqrt{d}(M_\zeta + M).$$

Let $T^* > 0$ be such that

$$2T^*\sqrt{d}e^{T^*C_1}\left[C_2 + C_3(K_2 + T^*C_4)e^{T^*C_5}\right] = 1. \tag{4.20}$$

Theorem 6. Uniqueness.
Under the assumptions of this subsection for any $0 < T < T^*$ there exists a unique feedback solution (γ, m, X) of the mean field game. It is such that γ is the feedback control γ_m.

Proof. In the notation of Theorem 2, the map $\Phi : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ is defined by $\Phi(m) = \{Flow(X_{\gamma_m,m})\}$, a singleton. If we prove that this map is a contraction for small time T, then the assertion follows by the Banach-Cacciopoli Theorem. So let $m, n \in \mathcal{L}$ and set $X := X_{\gamma_m,m}$ and $Y := X_{\gamma_n,n}$. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote $|v|_\infty = \max_{x\in\Sigma}|v_x|$.

First we prove that the value function V_m is Lipschitz continuous with respect to m. Thanks to the HJB equation (4.6) we have

$$V_m(t,x) = V_m(T,x) + \int_t^T H(s,x,a^*(s,x,m(s),V_m(s,\cdot)),m(s),V_m(s,\cdot))ds.$$

The Hamiltonian H is Lipschitz in (a,p,g); in fact, by (2.6) and (4.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|H(t,x,a,p,g)-H(t,x,b,q,h)|\\&\le 2|g|_\infty\left(\sqrt{d}|a-b|+dK_\varsigma|p-q|\right)+K_2(|a-b|+|p-q|)+\sqrt{d}(M_\varsigma+M)|g-h|.\end{aligned}$$

Then using (4.18) and (4.19) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&|V_m(t,x)-V_n(t,x)|\\&\qquad\le K_2|m(T)-n(T)|+\int_t^T\left[C_4|m(s)-n(s)|+C_5|V_m(s)-V_n(s)|\right]ds\\&\qquad\le K_2|m(T)-n(T)|+C_4(T-t)||m-n||_\infty+\int_t^T C_5|V_m(s)-V_n(s)|ds\end{aligned}$$

for any x and hence Gronwall's lemma implies that

$$|V_m(t)-V_n(t)|\le\sqrt{d}(K_2+TC_4)e^{TC_5}||m-n||_\infty$$

for any $0\le t\le T$.

Therefore, by applying again (4.18) and (4.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&E|X(t)-Y(t)|\\&\le\int_0^t\int_U E|f(s,X(s),u,\gamma(s,X(s),m(s),V_m(t,\cdot)),m(s))\\&\qquad-f(s,Y(s),u,\gamma(s,Y(s),n(s),V_n(t,\cdot)),n(s))|\nu(du)ds\\&\le\int_0^t\left[C_1E|X(s)-Y(s)|+C_2|m(s)-n(s)|+\frac{2d\sqrt{d}}{\theta}|V_m(t,\cdot)-V_n(t,\cdot)|\right]ds\\&\le\int_0^t\left[C_1E|X(s)-Y(s)|+C_2|m(s)-n(s)|+C_3(K_2+C_4T)e^{TC_5}||m-n||_\infty\right]ds\end{aligned}$$

and thus, again by Gronwall's lemma,

$$E|X(t)-Y(t)|\le T^*e^{T^*C_1}\left[C_2+C_3(K_2+T^*C_4)e^{T^*C_5}\right]$$

for any $0\le t\le T$. Since $|Law(X(t))-Law(Y(t))|\le 2\sqrt{d}E|X(t)-Y(t)|$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le t\le T}|LawX(t)-LawY(t)|=:||Flow(X)-Flow(Y)||_\infty\\&\qquad\le 2T^*\sqrt{d}e^{T^*C_1}\left[C_2+C_3(K_2+T^*C_4)e^{T^*C_5}\right]||m-n||_\infty\end{aligned}$$

and then the claim holds for T^* satisfying (4.20).

□

5. Approximation of N-player game

5.1. **Approximation of relaxed controls.** In order to get an ε-Nash equilibrium in open-loop strategies, respectively in feedback strategies, we have firstly to find an approximation of the optimal relaxed control, respectively relaxed feedback control, for the mean field game. To this end, we will make use of the following version of the chattering lemma.

Lemma 7 (Chattering)**.** *For any relaxed control $\rho\in\mathcal{R}$ there exist a sequence of stochastic open-loop controls $\alpha_n\in\mathcal{A}$ such that, denoting by $\rho^{\alpha_n}(dt,da)=\delta_{\alpha_n(t)}(da)dt$ their relaxed control representation,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\rho^{\alpha_n}=\rho\quad P-a.s., \tag{5.1}$$

where the limit is in the weak topology in $\mathcal{M}([0,T]\times A)$. Moreover any α_n takes values in a finite subset of A.

For any relaxed feedback control $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ there exist a sequence of feedback controls $\gamma_n \in \mathbb{A}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \delta_{\gamma_n(t,x)}(da)dt = [\widehat{\gamma}(t,x)](da)dt \tag{5.2}$$

uniformly in $x \in \Sigma$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \rho^{\gamma_n} = \rho^{\widehat{\gamma}} \quad P\text{-a.s.}, \tag{5.3}$$

where ρ^{γ_n} denotes the relaxed control representation of the open-loop control α^{γ_n} corresponding to γ^n, as in (2.17), and $\rho^{\widehat{\gamma}}$ is defined in (2.29); i.e. $\rho_t^{\gamma_n}(da) = \delta_{\gamma_n(t,X_{\gamma_n}(t^-)}(da)$ and $\rho_t^{\widehat{\gamma}}(da) = [\widehat{\gamma}(t, X_{\widehat{\gamma}}(t^-))](da)$.

Proof. The first part is proved as Theorem 3.5.2 in Kushner (1990, p. 59), and the construction of the approximating sequence in the proof gives the γ_n for the second part; let us show how to build them. Let $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$, cover A by M_r disjoint sets C_i^r which contain a point a_i^r and set $A^r := \{a_i^r : i \le M_r\}$, a finite subset of A. For any $\Delta > 0$ and i, j define the function

$$\tau_{ij}^{\Delta r}(x) := \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} [\widehat{\gamma}(s,x)](C_j^r)ds.$$

Divide any interval $[(i+1)\Delta, (i+2)\Delta[$ into M^r subintervals $I_{ij}^{\Delta r}(x)$ of length $\tau_{ij}^{\Delta r}(x)$ and define the feedback control $\gamma^{\Delta r}$, which is piecewise constant, by

$$\gamma^{\Delta r}(t,x) := \begin{cases} a_0 & t \in [0, \Delta[\\ a_j^r & t \in I_{ij}^{\Delta r}(x) \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

where a_0 is an arbitrary value in A. The proof in Kushner (1990) shows that

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to 0 \\ \Delta\to 0}} \delta_{\gamma^{\Delta r}(t,x)}(da)dt = [\widehat{\gamma}(t,x)](da)dt$$

weakly, for any $x \in \Sigma$. Since Σ is finite we obtain that there exists a sequence of ordinary feedback controls (γ_n) such that (5.2) holds uniformly in x. Let $m \in \mathcal{L}$ be fixed and X_n be the solution to (2.16) corresponding to the feedback control γ_n. By Theorem 1 the sequence X_n is tight and there is a subsequence which we still denote as (X_n) and a process X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} X_n = X$ is distribution. Possibly applying the Skorokhod representation (Theorem 4.30 in Kallenberg, 2001, p. 79) we can assume that this convergence is with probability one in the space of càdlàg functions $D([0,T], \Sigma)$ equipped with the Skorokhod metric. This implies in particular that

$$P\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} X_n(t) = X(t) \text{ for any } t \notin \overline{\eta}\right) = 1, \tag{5.5}$$

where $\overline{\eta}$ is the finite random set of discontinuity points (the jumps) of X.

Let now $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}([0,T] \times A)$ be any continuous function, which is also bounded as A is compact. We have to show the convergence to zero of

$$\int_0^T \int_A \varphi(t,a)[\delta_{\gamma_n(t,X_n(t^-))} - \widehat{\gamma}(t, X(t^-))](da)dt = Y_n + Z_n,$$

where

$$Y_n = \int_0^T \left[\varphi(t, \gamma_n(t, X_n(t^-))) - \varphi(t, \gamma_n(t, X(t^-)))\right] dt$$

$$Z_n = \int_0^T \int_A \varphi(t,a)[\delta_{\gamma_n(t,X(t^-))} - \widehat{\gamma}(t, X(t^-))](da)dt.$$

Any feedback control is Lipschitz in x, i.e. $dist(\gamma_n(t,x),\gamma_n(t,y)) \leq Diam(A)|x-y|$, and so Y_n tends to zero thanks to (5.5), the continuity of φ and dominate convergence.

As to Z_n, write $Z_n = \sum_{x\in\Sigma} Z_n^x$ where

$$Z_n^x := \int_0^T \int_A \mathbb{1}_{\eta_x}(t)\varphi(t,a)[\delta_{\gamma_n(t,x)} - \widehat{\gamma}(t,x)](da)dt$$

and η_x is the random set in $[0,T]$ where $X(t) = x$. For each x, the random set D_x of discontinuity points of the function $\mathbb{1}_{\eta_x}(t)\varphi(t,a)$ is a subset of $\overline{\eta}_x \times A$ for some finite random set $\overline{\eta}_x \subset [0,T]$. Thus D_x has null measure with respect to the limiting control $\widehat{\gamma}(t,x)(da)dt$ with probability one, for each x, thanks to Definition 5. Hence by (5.2) we get that Z_n^x tends to zero for each x and so does Z_n since Σ is finite.

Let then $\alpha_n(t) = \gamma_n(t, X_n(t^-))$ be the open-loop control corresponding to γ_n and ρ^n its relaxed control representation. We have just proved that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \rho^n = [\widehat{\gamma}(t, X(t^-))](da)dt$ P-almost surely and thus Theorem 1 says that X must have the same law as the solution to (2.28) under the relaxed feedback control $\widehat{\gamma}$. That solution is unique by Lemma 1, meaning that $X = X_{\widehat{\gamma}}$ in distribution. Therefore (5.3) follows since $\rho_t^{\widehat{\gamma}} = \widehat{\gamma}(t, X_{\widehat{\gamma}}(t^-))$ by (2.29).

□

Remark 2. *In the above proof we strongly used the finiteness of Σ to get the approximation in feedback controls. While the result in the open-loop setting holds for general state space Σ, when considering feedback controls it is not clear whether the above lemma can be generalized to uncountably infinite state spaces.*

We are now able to state the approximation result:

Proposition 3. *Let $m \in \mathcal{L}$, $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}$ such that*

$$E\left[\sup_{t\geq 0} |X_{\alpha,m}(t) - X_{\rho,m}(t)|\right] \leq \varepsilon \tag{5.6}$$

$$E\left[\sup_{t\geq 0} |X_{\gamma,m}(t) - X_{\widehat{\gamma},m}(t)|\right] \leq \varepsilon \tag{5.7}$$

$$|J(\alpha,m) - J(\rho,m)| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{5.8}$$

$$|J(\gamma,m) - J(\widehat{\gamma},m)| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{5.9}$$

Proof. Let (α_n) be a sequence in $\mathcal{A}$ that approximates ρ as in lemma 7. Then we apply Theorem 1 to the sequence $(X_{\alpha_n,m}, \alpha_n, m)$: it is tight, a subsequence $(X_{\alpha_{n_k},m}, \alpha_{n_k}, m)$ converges in distribution to $(X_{\rho,m}, \rho, m)$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} J(\alpha_{n_k}, m) = J(\rho, m)$. Thus there exist $\alpha_{n_k} =: \alpha$ for which (5.6) and (5.8) hold. In a similar way, one proves (5.7) and (5.9) for feedback controls. □

5.2. **ε_N-Nash equilibria.** We can now define the approximate Nash equilibrium for the N-player game, first in open-loop form.

Notation 2. *Let $\left(\left((\Omega,\mathcal{F},P;(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}),\alpha,\xi,\mathcal{N}\right), m, X_{\rho,m}\right)$ be a relaxed solution of the mean field game (2.26), which exists assuming (A) and (B) by Theorem 2. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ be as in Proposition 3, satisfying (5.6) and (5.8) with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$. Then $\left((\Omega,\mathcal{F},P;(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}), \alpha^N, \xi^N, \mathcal{N}^N\right)$ denotes the strategy vector where $\alpha^N = (\alpha_1^N,\dots,\alpha_N^N)$, $\xi^N = (\xi_1^N,\dots,\xi_N^N)$ and $\mathcal{N}^N = (\mathcal{N}_1^N,\dots,\mathcal{N}_N^N)$, such that*

$$Law\left((\alpha_1^N,\xi_1^N,\mathcal{N}_1^N),\dots,(\alpha_N^N,\xi_N^N,\mathcal{N}_N^N)\right) = (Law(\alpha,\xi,\mathcal{N}))^{\otimes N}. \tag{5.10}$$

Equation (5.10) says that this control is symmetric. The following is our main result, whose proof is carried out in the next subsection. In addition to (A) and (B), we make the Lipschitz assumptions (A') and (B').

Theorem 7. *Assume (A') and (B'). Then the vector strategy defined in Notation 2 is an ε_N-Nash equilibrium for the N-player game for any N where $\varepsilon_N \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}$ and $C = C(T, d, \nu(U), K_1, K_2)$ is a constant.*

The same result holds when considering feedback strategies, but we state it separately.

Notation 3. *Let $\left(\left((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}), \widehat{\gamma}, \xi, \mathcal{N}\right), m, X_{\widehat{\gamma},m}\right)$ be a relaxed feedback solution of the mean field game (2.28), which exists assuming (A) and (B) by Theorem 3. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}$ be as in Proposition 3, satisfying (5.7) and (5.9) with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$. Then $\left((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}), \gamma^N, \xi^N, \mathcal{N}^N\right)$ denotes the feedback strategy vector where $\gamma^N = (\gamma_1^N, \dots, \gamma_N^N)$, $\xi^N = (\xi_1^N, \dots, \xi_N^N)$ and $\mathcal{N}^N = (\mathcal{N}_1^N, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N^N)$, such that*

$$\gamma_i^N(t, x^N) := \gamma(t, x_i^N) \tag{5.11}$$

for any t, i and $x^N = (x_1^N, \dots, x_N^N) \in \Sigma^N$, and the $(\xi_i^N, \mathcal{N}_i^N)$ are N i.i.d copies of $(\xi, \mathcal{N})$.

Equation (5.11) says that this feedback strategy vector is symmetric and decentralized. In order to obtain feedback ε-Nash equilibria from mean field game solution, we need the Lipschitz assumptions (A") and (B").

Theorem 8. *Assume (A"), (B"). Then the feedback strategy vector defined in Notation 3 is a feedback ε_N-Nash equilibrium for the N-player game for any N where $\varepsilon_N \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}$ and $C = C(T, d, \nu(U), K_1, K_2)$ is a constant.*

5.3. **Proofs of the results.** In the following C will denote any constant which depends on T, d, $\nu(U)$ and the Lipschitz constants K_1 and K_2, not on N and is allowed to change from line to line. We focus first on open-loop controls. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let the strategy vector α^N be as in Notation 2. We play this strategy in the N-player game:

$$X_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, X_i^N(s^-), u, \alpha_i^N(s), \mu_N(s^-))\mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du) \qquad i = 1, \dots, N. \tag{5.12}$$

This will be coupled with Y^N defined by

$$Y_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, Y_i^N(s^-), u, \alpha_i^N(s), m(s))\mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du) \qquad i = 1, \dots, N. \tag{5.13}$$

Let $\mu^N(t) := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_i^N(t)}$ be the empirical measure of the system (5.12) and $\overline{\mu}_N$ be the empirical measure of (5.13). Denote $\overline{m}(t) := Law(X_{\alpha,m}(t))$. By (5.6) we have

$$|\overline{m}(t) - m(t)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \tag{5.14}$$

for any $t \geq 0$, since $Flow(X_{\rho,m}) = m$. From (5.10) it follows that

$$Law(Y_i^N, \alpha_i^N, \xi_i^N, \mathcal{N}_i^N) = Law(X_{\alpha,m}, \alpha, \xi, \mathcal{N}), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

This implies, thanks to Theorem 1 in Fournier and Guillin (2015), that

$$E|\overline{\mu}^N(t) - \overline{m}(t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} \tag{5.15}$$

for any $t \in [0,T]$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where C is a constant. This upper bound in $N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ cannot be improved, since for these discrete measures a lower bound still in $N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ can be found, see again Fournier and Guillin (2015).

Lemma 8. *Under assumption (A'), for every $t \geq 0$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$*

$$E|\mu^N(t) - m(t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} \tag{5.16}$$

$$E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{5.17}$$

Proof. From (5.14) and (5.15) it follows that

$$E|\overline{\mu}^N(t) - m(t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{5.18}$$

We estimate $|\mu^N(t) - \overline{\mu}^N(t)|$ using the 1-Wasserstein metric (which is equivalent to the Euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^d$) and (5.12), (5.13) and the Lipschitz assumption (2.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
E|\mu^N(t) - \overline{\mu}^N(t)| &\leq \frac{C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| \\
&\leq \frac{C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N E|X_i^N(0) - Y_i^N(0)| + \frac{C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \int_U E|f(s, X_i^N(s), u, \alpha_i^N(s), \mu_N(s^-)) \\
&- f(s, Y_i^N(s), u, \alpha_i^N(s), m(s))|\nu(du)ds \\
&\leq \frac{C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N K_1 \int_0^t \left[E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| + E|\mu^N(t) - m(t)|\right] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence applying (5.18)

$$\begin{aligned}
E|\mu^N(t) - m(t)| &+ \frac{C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| \\
&\leq E|\overline{\mu}^N(t) - m(t)| + \frac{2C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} + 2K_1 \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \left[E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| + E|\mu^N(t) - m(t)|\right] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain, by Gronwall's lemma,

$$E|\mu^N(t) - m(t)| + \frac{C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} + 2K_1 \int_0^t e^{2K(t-s)} \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} ds \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Similarly we show (5.17): using (5.12), (5.13) and (5.16) we get, for any i,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| \\
&\leq \int_0^t \int_U E\left|f(s, X_i^N(s), u, \alpha_i^N(s), \mu_N(s)) - f(s, Y_i^N(s), u, \alpha_i^N(s), m(s))\right| \nu(du)ds \\
&\leq K_1 \int_0^t \left[E|X_i^N(s) - Y_i^N(s)| + E|\mu^N(s) - m(s)|\right] ds \\
&\leq K_1 \int_0^t \left[E|X_i^N(s) - Y_i^N(s)| + \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}\right] ds
\end{aligned}$$

and hence $E|X_i^N(t) - Y_i^N(t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}$ by Gronwall's lemma.

□

We are now in the position to state the result about the costs. Because of the symmetry of the problem, we shall consider only $i = 1$.

Lemma 9. *Under assumptions (A') and (B')*

$$|J_1^N(\alpha^N) - J(\rho, m)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{5.19}$$

Proof. Inequality (5.8), together with notation 2, yields

$$|J(\alpha, m) - J(\rho, m)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{5.20}$$

While from (2.5), (5.16) and (5.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_1^N(\alpha^N) - J(\alpha, m)| &\leq E|\psi(X_1^N(T), \mu^N(T)) - \psi(Y_1^N(T), m(T))| \\
&\quad + E\int_0^T |c(t, X_1^N(t), \alpha_1^N(t), \mu^N(t)) - c(t, Y_1^N(t), \alpha_1^N(t), m(t))|dt \\
&\leq K_2 \int_0^T \left[E|X_1^N(t) - Y_1^N(t)| + E|\mu^N(t) - m(t)|\right] dt \\
&\quad + K_2 \left[E|X_1^N(T) - Y_1^N(T)| + E|\mu^N(T) - m(T)|\right] \\
&\leq K_2 T \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} + K_2 \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}},
\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (5.20), gives the claim. □

We consider then any $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$ and the perturbed strategy vector $[\alpha^{N,-1}, \beta]$. We denote by $\widetilde{X}^N$ the solution to

$$\widetilde{X}_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, \widetilde{X}_i^N(s^-), u, [\alpha^{N,-1}, \beta]_i(s), \widetilde{\mu}_N(s^-)) \mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du) \tag{5.21}$$

for each $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Set also $\widetilde{Y}_1 := X_{\beta,m}$ and $\widetilde{\mu}_N(t) := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\widetilde{X}_i^N(t)}$.

Lemma 10. *Under assumption (A'), for any $t \geq 0$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$*

$$E|\mu^N(t) - \widetilde{\mu}^N(t)| \leq \frac{C}{N} \tag{5.22}$$

$$E|\widetilde{\mu}^N(t) - m(t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} \tag{5.23}$$

$$E|\widetilde{X}_1^N(t) - \widetilde{Y}_1(t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{5.24}$$

Proof. We make the rough estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
E|\mu^N(t) - \widetilde{\mu}^N(t)| &\leq \frac{1}{N} E|X_1^N(t) - \widetilde{X}_1^N(t)| + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=2}^N E|X_i^N(t) - \widetilde{X}_i^N(t)| \\
&\leq \frac{d}{N} + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=2}^N \int_0^t \int_U E|f(s, X_i^N(s), u, \alpha_i^N(s), \mu_N(s)) \\
&\qquad - f(s, \widetilde{X}_i^N(s), u, \alpha_i^N(s), \widetilde{\mu}_N(s))|\nu(du)ds \\
&\leq \frac{d}{N} + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=2}^N K_1 \int_0^t \left[E|X_i^N(t) - \widetilde{X}_i^N(t)| + E|\mu^N(t) - \widetilde{\mu}_N(s)|\right] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$E|\mu^N(t)-\widetilde{\mu}_N(s)|+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=2}^{N}E|X_i^N(t)-\widetilde{X}_i^N(t)|$$
$$\leq \frac{d}{N}+2K_1\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=2}^{N}\int_0^t\Big[E|X_i^N(t)-\widetilde{X}_i^N(t)|+E|\mu^N(t)-\widetilde{\mu}_N(s)|\Big]\,ds$$

and then, by Gronwall's lemma,

$$E|\mu^N(t)-\widetilde{\mu}_N(s)|+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=2}^{N}E|X_i^N(t)-\widetilde{X}_i^N(t)|\leq\frac{d}{N}e^{2K_1T}\leq\frac{C}{N}.$$

Therefore (5.22) is proved. Estimate (5.23) follows from (5.22) and (5.16) and the fact that $\frac{1}{N}\leq\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ for any $N\in\mathbb{N}$. While (5.24) is a consequence of (5.23):

$$E|\widetilde{X}_1^N(t)-\widetilde{Y}_1(t)|$$
$$\leq\int_0^t\int_U E\Big|f(s,\widetilde{X}_1^N(s),u,\beta(s),\widetilde{\mu}_N(s))-f(s,\widetilde{Y}_1(s),u,\beta(s),m(s))\Big|\,\nu(du)ds$$
$$\leq K_1\int_0^t\Big[E|\widetilde{X}_1^N(s)-\widetilde{Y}_1(s)|+E|\mu^N(s)-m(s)|\Big]\,ds$$
$$\leq K_1\int_0^t\left[E|\widetilde{X}_1^N(s)-\widetilde{Y}_1(s)|+\frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}\right]ds$$

and we conclude by Gronwall's lemma.

□

Lemma 11. *Under assumptions (A') and (B')*

$$|J_1^N([\alpha^{N,-1},\beta])-J(\beta,m)|\leq\frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{5.25}$$

Proof. Inequalities (2.5), (5.23) and (5.24) give

$$|J_1^N([\alpha^{N,-1},\beta])-J(\beta,m)|\leq E|\psi(\widetilde{X}_1^N(T),\widetilde{\mu}^N(T))-\psi(\widetilde{Y}_1(T),m(T))|$$
$$+E\int_0^T|c(t,\widetilde{X}_1^N(t),\beta(t),\widetilde{\mu}^N(t))-c(t,\widetilde{Y}_1(t),\beta(t),m(t))|dt$$
$$\leq K_2\int_0^T\Big[E|\widetilde{X}_1^N(t)-\widetilde{Y}_1(t)|+E|\widetilde{\mu}^N(t)-m(t)|\Big]\,dt$$
$$+K_2\Big[E|\widetilde{X}_1^N(T)-\widetilde{Y}_1(T)|+E|\widetilde{\mu}^N(T)-m(T)|\Big]$$
$$\leq K_2T\frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}+K_2\frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}\leq\frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

□

We are now able to prove our main Theorem 7, combining lemmas 9 and 11.

Proof. of Theorem 7.

Inequalities (5.19), (5.25) and the optimality of ρ yield

$$J_1^N(\alpha^N)\leq J(\rho,m)+\frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}\leq J(\beta,m)+\frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}\leq J_1^N([\alpha^{N,-1},\beta])+\frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

□

Remark 3. *We observe that α^N is still an ε_N-Nash equilibrium if we assume only (B) instead of (B'), but without the estimate of the order of convergence $\varepsilon_N \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}$. Namely, there exist a sequence (ε_N) such that $\lim_{N\to\infty} \varepsilon_N = 0$.*

Proof. of Theorem 8.

The argument is the same as in the proof of Theorem 7. The difference is that equations (5.12), (5.13) and (5.21) become respectively, for each $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$X_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, X_i^N(s^-), u, \gamma(s, X_i^N(s^-)), \mu_N(s^-))\mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du)$$

$$Y_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, Y_i^N(s^-), u, \gamma(s, Y_i^N(s^-)), m(s))\mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du)$$

and

$$\widetilde{X}_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, \widetilde{X}_i^N(s^-), u, [\gamma^{N,-1}, \beta]_i(s), \widetilde{\mu}_N(s^-))\mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du)$$

where the latter means that

$$\widetilde{X}_1^N(t) = \xi_1^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, \widetilde{X}_1^N(s^-), u, \beta(s), \widetilde{\mu}_N(s^-))\mathcal{N}_1^N(ds, du)$$

and

$$\widetilde{X}_i^N(t) = \xi_i^N + \int_0^t \int_U f(s, \widetilde{X}_i^N(s^-), u, \gamma(s, \widetilde{X}_i^N(s^-)), \widetilde{\mu}_N(s^-))\mathcal{N}_i^N(ds, du)$$

for $i = 2, \dots, N$, thanks to Notation 1. The estimates we need to apply Gronwall's lemma, in particular in the proof of lemma 10, are found using also (2.4) and the fact that $dist(\gamma(s, x), \gamma(s, y)) \leq Diam(A)|x - y|$ for every s and each x and y in the finite Σ. □

6. Conclusions

We summarize here the results we have obtained. The assumptions are given in Section 2.1 and verified for a natural shape of the dynamics in Lemmas 2 and 3.

(1) Under assumptions (A) and (B), there exist a relaxed mean field game solution and a relaxed feedback mean field game solution (in the sense of Definition 7), see Theorems 2 and 3.
(2) Assuming (A), (B), (C) and (D), there exists a feedback solution of the mean field game (Definition 4), see Corollary 1. The feedback mean field game solution is unique for small T under the additional assumptions of Section 4.3 by Theorem 6.
(3) The relaxed mean field game solutions provide ε_N-Nash equilibria for the N-player game (cf. Definition 2) for any N both in open-loop and in feedback form (not relaxed), with $\varepsilon_N \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}$. If (A') and (B') hold, then the symmetric open-loop strategy vector defined in Notation 2 is an ε_N-Nash equilibrium by Theorem 7. Assuming (A") and (B"), the feedback strategy vector defined in Notation 3, which is symmetric and decentralized, is a feedback ε_N-Nash equilibrium thanks to Theorem 8.

Appendix A. Relaxed Poisson measures

In order to state the definition of the relaxed Poisson random measure we first need to define the canonical space of integer valued random measures on a metric space E. Following Jacod (1979), the setting is:

- $\overline{\Omega} := \{$ sequences $(t_n, y_n) \subset [0, +\infty[\times E, \quad t_m \neq t_n\}$;
- if $\overline{\omega} = (t_n, y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ write $T_n(\overline{\omega}) := t_n$ and $Y_n(\overline{\omega}) := y_n$;

- the *canonical random measure* is

$$\overline{\mathcal{N}}(\overline{\omega}, B) := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{T_n(\overline{\omega})<\infty}\delta_{(T_n(\overline{\omega}),Y_n(\overline{\omega})}(B)$$

  for any $B \in \mathcal{B}([0,+\infty[\times E)$;
- $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_t := \sigma\left(\overline{\mathcal{N}}(\cdot, B) : B \in \mathcal{B}([0,t]\times E)\right)$, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_0$ is given, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t = \overline{\mathcal{F}_0} \vee \left(\cap_{s<t}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s\right)$, $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\infty$ and $\overline{\mathbb{F}} = (\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\geq 0}$.

The filtered space $(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathbb{F}})$ is then the *canonical space of integer valued random measures on* E. A probability measure on it is the law of an integer valued random measure on E, given an initial condition on $\overline{\mathcal{F}_0}$. Note that the canonical measure $\overline{N}$ is not the identity: for this reason we can work with $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}([0,+\infty[\times E)$ as the state space of a random measure. Moreover the set of integer valued random measures is vaguely closed in $\mathcal{M}$: see Theorem 15.7.4 in Kallenberg (1986) and the references therein.

Let now Θ be any integer valued random measure defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$. It is determined by a sequence of stopping times T_n and random variables X_n which are $\mathcal{F}_{T_n}$-measurable. To any Θ is associated its *compensator*, i.e. a positive random measure η on E such that

(1) $\eta([0,t]\times B)_{t\geq 0}$ is predictable for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$;
(2) $(\Theta([0,t\wedge T_n]\times B) - \eta([0,t\wedge T_n]\times B))_{t\geq 0}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale for each n and B;
(3) $\eta(\{t\}\times E) \leq 1$ for each t and $\eta([T_\infty, \infty[\times E) = 0$.

The compensator exists and is unique (up to a modification on a P-null set) for any Θ. The proof can be found in Jacod (1975), where the author also shows that a process with the above properties uniquely determines an integer valued random measure.

Consider then an arbitrary measurable space $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$ and define $\Omega := \overline{\Omega}\times\Omega'$. Set $\overline{\mathcal{F}_0} := \left\{\varnothing, \overline{\Omega}\right\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_0 := \overline{\mathcal{F}_0}\otimes\mathcal{F}'$. The canonical random measure $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ on $\overline{\Omega}$ is extended to Ω via $(T_n, Y_n).(\overline{\omega}, \omega') := (T_n, Y_n).(\overline{\omega})$. Set $\mathcal{F}_t := \overline{\mathcal{F}}_t \vee \mathcal{F}_0$.

Theorem 9 (Jacod (1975))**.** *Let P_0 be a probability measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0)$ and η a predictable random measure satisfying (1) and (3). Then there exists a unique probability measure P on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty)$ whose restriction to $\mathcal{F}_0$ is P_0 and for which η in the compensator of $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$.*

By means of this theorem we are able to define properly a Poisson random measure. Consider a relaxed control $((\Omega'', \mathcal{F}'', P''; \mathbb{F}''), \rho, \xi, \mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{R}$ and let $\Omega' = \mathcal{D}\times\Sigma\times\overline{\Omega}$ be the state space of the process ρ, the initial point ξ and the Poisson random measure $\mathcal{N}$. The σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}'$ is generated by the processes and P_0 is the joint law of $(\rho, \xi, \mathcal{N})$. So a relaxed Poisson measure N_ρ, related to the relaxed control ρ, is an integer valued random measure on $[0,T]\times U\times A$ whose compensator η, calculated on t, U_0, A_0, is $\nu(U_0)\rho(t, A_0)$. Its law is uniquely determined on $\overline{\Omega}$ and it has thus the martingale properties (2.23) and (2.24). Moreover the joint law of $(\mathcal{N}_\rho, \rho, \xi, \mathcal{N})$ is uniquely determined.

We may give an explicit construction of $\mathcal{N}_\rho$. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ and (α_n) be a sequence in $\mathcal{A}$ which tends to ρ in the sense of Lemma 7, the chattering lemma. Denote by ρ^{α_n} the relaxed control representation of α_n and construct $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_n}$ as in (2.25): $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_n}(t, U_0, A_0) := \int_0^t \int_{U_0} \mathbb{1}_{A_0}(\alpha_n(s))\mathcal{N}(ds, du)$. Then by Theorem 1 the sequence $(X_{\alpha_n}, \rho^{\alpha_n}, \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_n})$ is tight and any subsequence converges in distribution to $(X_\rho, \rho, \mathcal{N}_\rho)$. Therefore the marginals are uniquely defined in this way, while to show that the joint law of $(\rho, \mathcal{N}_\rho)$ is unique we need to invoke the above Theorem 9.

A.1. **Proof of lemma 1.** Let $m \in \mathcal{L}$ be fixed, which we shall omit. Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be the space of stochastic processes with paths in $D([0,T],\Sigma)$ and equip it with the norm $||X|| = E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T}|X(t)|\right]$. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ and define the map $G : \mathcal{Z} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ by

$$G_t(X) := \xi + \int_0^t \int_U \int_A f(s, X(s^-), u, a)\mathcal{N}_\rho(ds, du, da)$$

for any $X \in \mathcal{Z}$. If we prove that this map is a contraction in the norm $||\cdot||$ then pathwise existence and uniqueness of solutions to equation (2.26) follow. We have, for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$|G_t(X) - G_t(Y)| \le \int_0^t \int_U \int_A |f(s, X(s^-), u, a) - f(s, Y(s^-), u, a)|\mathcal{N}_\rho(ds, du, da)$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T}|G_t(X) - G_t(Y)|\right] \\ &\quad\le E\int_0^T \int_U \int_A |f(s, X(s), u, a) - f(s, Y(s), u, a)|\rho_s(da)\nu(du)ds \\ &\quad\le K_1 E\int_0^T \int_A |X(s) - Y(s)|\rho_s(da)ds \le K_1 T E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T}|X(s) - Y(s)|\right] \end{aligned}$$

thanks to (2.1) and the fact that ρ_s is a probability measure. Therefore G is a contraction if $T < \frac{1}{K_1}$ and so uniqueness is proved for small time; but then iterating the same argument we have uniqueness for any T.

Consider now $\widehat{\gamma} \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ and define $\widehat{G} : \mathcal{Z} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ by

$$\widehat{G}_t(X) := \xi + \int_0^t \int_U \int_A f(s, X(s^-), u, a)\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}}(ds, du, da)$$

for any process $X \in \mathcal{Z}$. Then for any X and Y we have $||\widehat{G}(X) - \widehat{G}(Y)|| \le ||Z_1|| + ||Z_2||$ where

$$Z_1(t) := \int_0^t \int_U \int_A |f(s, X(s^-), u, a) - f(s, Y(s^-), u, a)|\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},Y}}(ds, du, da)$$

and

$$Z_2(t) := \int_0^t \int_U \int_A |f(s, X(s^-), u, a)|\left|\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}} - \mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},Y}}\right|(ds, du, da),$$

whereas $|\Theta|$ denotes the total variation of the signed measure Θ define for any $C \in \mathcal{B}([0,T]\times U\times A)$ by $|\Theta|(C) := \sup_{E\subseteq C}|\Theta(E)|$; while the total variation norm is $||\Theta||_{TV} = |\Theta|([0,T]\times U\times A)$. The first term Z_1 is bounded as above obtaining $||Z_1|| \le K_1 T||X - Y||$. While for the second we bound $|f| \le d$ and hence

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} Z_2(t) \le d||\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}} - \mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},Y}}||_{TV} = d\sup_{E\subset[0,T]\times U\times A}\left|\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}}(E) - \mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},Y}}(E)\right|.$$

Thanks to (2.23) and (2.19) we have $E||\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}} - \mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},Y}}||_{TV} \le 2T\nu(U)$, saying that the rhs above is finite P-a.s. Since the measure $\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}} - \mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},Y}}$ is integer valued we can assume that the above supremum is attained in a set $C(\omega)$ for P-a.e. ω, giving thus a random set C. Moreover we may assume that in such set the random

measure considered is positive. The martingale property (2.24) gives

$$\begin{aligned}||Z_2|| &\leq dE\left[\mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},X}}(C) - \mathcal{N}_{\rho^{\widehat{\gamma},Y}}(C)\right] \\ &= d\left|E\int_0^T\int_U\int_A \mathbb{1}_C(t,u,a)[\widehat{\gamma}(t,X(t)) - \widehat{\gamma}(t,Y(t))](da)\nu(du)dt\right| \\ &\leq dE\int_0^T |\widehat{\gamma}(t,X(t)) - \widehat{\gamma}(t,Y(t))|(A)\nu(U)dt \\ &\leq 2\nu(U)dE\int_0^T |X(t) - Y(t)|dt \leq K_1T||X-Y||,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the facts that $\widehat{\gamma}$ is a probability measure and $|x-y| \geq 1$ for each $x \neq y \in \Sigma$. Therefore for $T < \frac{1}{2K_1}$ the map $\widehat{G}$ is a contraction and so the conclusion follows iterating the procedure as above.

References

D. Aldous. Stopping times and tightness. *Ann. Probab.*, 6(2):335–340, 1978.

R. Basna, A. Hilbert, and V. N. Kolokoltsov. An epsilon-nash equilibrium for non-linear markov games of mean-field-type on finite spaces. *Comm. Stoch. Anal.*, 8 (4):449–468, 2014.

C. Benazzoli, L. Campi, and L. Di Persio. Mean-field games with jumps. arXiv:1703.01919 [math.PR], March 2017.

A. Bensoussan, J. Frehse, and P. Yam. *Mean Field Games and Mean Field Type Control Theory*. Springer Briefs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2013.

A. Bensoussan, K. Sung, S. Yam, and S. Yung. Linear-quadratic mean field games. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 169(2):496–529, 2016.

G. Brunick and S. E. Shreve. Mimicking an Itô process by a solution of a stochastic differential equation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(4):1584–1628, 2013.

P. Cardaliaguet. Notes on mean field games. Technical report, Université de Paris - Dauphine, September 2013.

P. Cardaliaguet, F. Delarue, J.-M. Lasry, and P.-L. Lions. The master equation and the convergence problem in mean field games. arXiv:1509.02505 [math.AP], September 2015.

R. Carmona and F. Delarue. Probabilistic analysis of mean-field games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(4):2705–2734, 2013.

R. Carmona and D. Lacker. A probabilistic weak formulation of mean field games and applications. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 25(3):1189–1231, 2015.

R. Carmona, F. Delarue, and A. Lachapelle. Control of McKean-Vlasov dynamics versus mean field games. *Math. Financ. Econ.*, 7(2):131–166, 2013.

J. Doncel, N. Gast, and B. Gaujal. Mean-field games with explicit interactions. Preprint hal-01277098, February 2016.

K. Fan. Fixed-point and minimax theorems in locally convex topological linear spaces. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 38:121–126, 1952.

M. Fischer. On the connection between symmetric N-player games and mean field games. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, to appear, 2017. arXiv:1405.1345 [math.PR].

W. H. Fleming and H. M. Soner. *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, volume 25 of *Applications of Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2nd edition, 2006.

N. Fournier and A. Guillin. On the rate of convergence in wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 162:707–738, 2015.

D. A. Gomes, J. Mohr, and R. R. Souza. Continuous time finite state mean field games. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 68(1):99–143, 2013.

D. A. Gomes, L. Nurbekyan, and E. A. Pimentel. *Economic Models and Mean-Field Games Theory*. 30º Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática. IMPA, Rio de Janeiro, 2015.

C. Graham. McKean-Vlasov Itô-Skorohod equations, and nonlinear diffusions with discrete jump sets. *Stochastic Processes Appl.*, 40(1):69–82, 1992.

O. Hernández-Lerma and J. B. Lasserre. *Discrete-Time Markov Control Processes: Basic Optimality Criteria*, volume 30 of *Applications of Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 1996.

M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé, and P. E. Caines. Large population stochastic dynamic games: Closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle. *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, 6(3):221–252, 2006.

N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe. *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes*, volume 24 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. North Holland/Kodansha, Amsterdam, 2nd edition, 1989.

J. Jacod. Multivariate point processes: predictable projection, radon-nikodym derivatives, representation of martingales. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. verw. Gebiete*, 31:235–253, 1975.

J. Jacod. *Calcul Stochastique et Problèmes de Martingales*, volume 714 of *Lecture Notes in Math.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979.

O. Kallenberg. *Random Measures*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 4th edition, 1986.

O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Springer, Berlin, 2th edition, 2001.

V. N. Kolokoltsov, J. Li, and W. Yang. Mean field games and nonlinear Markov processes. arXiv:1112.3744 [math.PR], 2011.

H. J. Kushner. *Weak Convergence Methods and Singularly Perturbed Stochastic Control and Filtering Problems*, volume 3 of *Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1990.

H. J. Kushner and P. Dupuis. *Numerical Methods for Stochastic Control Problems in Continuous Time*, volume 24 of *Applications of Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2nd edition, 2001.

D. Lacker. Mean field games via controlled martingale problems: existence of Markovian equilibria. *Stochastic Processes Appl.*, 125(7):2856–2894, 2015.

D. Lacker. A general characterization of the mean field limit for stochastic differential games. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 165(3):581–648, 2016.

J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Japan. J. Math.*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.

A.-S. Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. In P.-L. Hennequin, editor, *Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX - 1989*, volume 1464 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 165–251, Berlin, 1991. Springer-Verlag.

N. Turchi. Approximate Nash equilibria in N-player games based on Poisson random measures. Master's thesis, University of Padua, 2015.

(A. Cecchin and M. Fischer)
Department of Mathematics "Tullio Levi Civita"
University of Padua
Via Trieste 63, 35121 Padova, Italy

E-mail address, A. Cecchin: alekos.cecchin@math.unipd.it

E-mail address, M. Fischer: fischer@math.unipd.it
URL: http://www.math.unipd.it/~fischer